

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office
P.O. Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-120-2007-13-EA

PROJECT NAME: Baker Spring Development

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T1N, R77W, 6th PM, Sec. 14

APPLICANT: Sandy Baker

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction/Issues and Concerns: Sandy Baker has the grazing preference on Allotment # 07530 (Linke). She has requested assistance with developing an additional water source in Allotment # 07530 to improve livestock distribution patterns. Uneven water distribution within the allotment has resulted in uneven livestock grazing. Development of Baker Spring in the southeastern part of the allotment (T1N, R77W, Section 14 NWNE) would improve cattle distribution by introducing a new water source in this lightly used portion of the allotment.

Proposed Action: Sandy Baker has applied to have an undeveloped spring in Allotment # 07530 (Linke) developed. The spring would be developed by installing a spring box and an underground 1½" pipeline of less than 500' to a water trough. An enclosure of less than 0.5 acre would be constructed to protect the water collection system. The enclosure fence would be a 4 wire fence with the bottom wire smooth and at least 16" from the ground. The other wires would be barbed and at heights of 6", 12", and 24" above the smooth wire. The total height of the fence would not exceed 40".

One water trough would be installed and would provide sufficient water for livestock and wildlife use. A wildlife ramp would be installed on the water trough to provide an escape route for small mammals and birds that may enter the trough to obtain water. Overflow from the water trough would be piped into the natural drainage channel from the spring. When the water is not needed for livestock use, the water would be diverted directly into the natural drainage.

A tracked backhoe would be used for the installation and all disturbed areas would be leveled and seeded with a mixture of native and introduced grass and forb species. The BLM zone crew would construct the pipeline in the summer of 2007 while the permittee would build the fence in 2007 or 2008. A map of the proposed project area is included in Attachment #1

No Action Alternative: The spring would not be developed and the benefits from an additional livestock watering location would not be realized.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION: The BLM is specifically responding to a proposal from Sandy Baker to develop an additional water source in allotment # 07530 (Linke) and install a pipeline from the spring to one livestock tank.

The purpose of the project would be to provide an additional water source for the livestock grazing in allotment # 07530 (Linke). This project is needed to provide better distribution of livestock throughout the allotment and more even utilization of the vegetation within the allotment.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

Decision Number/Page: Livestock grazing pages 4 through 7, as revised

Decision Language: Investing in cost-effective range improvements to implement grazing systems and meet the objectives of the AMP. Stock water developments would be authorized as a basis for implementing grazing systems; additional water sources could be turned on and off to regulate cattle distribution and use within pastures. This would allow previously developed water facilities to receive less concentrated use and would enhance grazing uniformity within pastures/allotments.

Standards for Public Land Health: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. The following are the approved standards:

Standard	Definition/Statement
#1 Upland Soils	Upland soils exhibit infiltration and permeability rates that are appropriate to soil type, climate, land form, and geologic processes. Adequate soil infiltration and permeability allows for the accumulation of soil moisture necessary for optimal plant growth and vigor, and minimizes surface runoff.
#2 Riparian Systems	Riparian systems associated with both running and standing water, function properly and have the ability to recover from major surface disturbances such as fire, severe grazing, or 100-year floods. Riparian vegetation captures sediment, and provides forage, habitat and bio-diversity. Water quality is improved or maintained. Stable soils store and release water slowly.
#3 Plant and Animal Communities	Healthy, productive plant and animal communities of native and other desirable species are maintained at viable population levels commensurate with the species and habitat's potential. Plants and animals at both the community and population level are productive, resilient, diverse, vigorous, and able to reproduce and sustain natural fluctuations, and ecological processes.
#4 Threatened and	Special status, threatened and endangered species (federal and state), and other plants and

Endangered Species	animals officially designated by the BLM, and their habitats are maintained or enhanced by sustaining healthy, native plant and animal communities.
#5 Water Quality	The water quality of all water bodies, including ground water where applicable, located on or influenced by BLM lands will achieve or exceed the Water Quality Standards established by the State of Colorado. Water Quality Standards for surface and ground waters include the designated beneficial uses, numeric criteria, narrative criteria, and anti-degradation requirements set forth under State law as found in (5 CCR 1002-8), as required by Section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act.

Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in the environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements below or in the Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Review Record and Checklist (IDT-RRC) (Appendix 1).

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS: The following critical elements: Air Quality, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Cultural Resources, Native American Religious Concerns, Environmental Justice, Farmlands- Prime and Unique, Floodplains, Wastes, Hazardous or Solid, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and Wilderness, etc. were evaluated and determined that they were not present or that there would be no impact to them from the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative. See IDT-RRC in Appendix 1 for further information.

The following critical elements were determined to be potentially impacted and were carried forward for analysis from the IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES

Affected Environment: The project area has been checked for invasive, non-native species (weeds). No weeds were observed in the project area at the time of the inspection.

Environmental Consequences: Any soil disturbing activity creates an avenue for the establishment and spread of invasive, non-native species. The proposed project would create temporary areas of disturbance associated with installation of the spring box, laying the pipeline to the water trough and installation of the water trough. Continued disturbance would occur in the vicinity of the water trough through use of the water by livestock and wildlife. The following mitigation and monitoring are proposed to mitigate potential impacts.

Mitigation:

-The disturbance associated with the installation of the pipeline and spring box would require reseeded with a BLM approved seed mix to re-establish native vegetation and reduce the chance of establishment or spread of invasive, non-native species.

-Periodic monitoring would be required following completion of the project to ensure weeds do not become established within the project area. If weeds do become established it would be the responsibility of the permittee to report the location of the weeds. The BLM, in partnership with Grand County, would be responsible for control of the invasive, non-native species.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The project area is located in a mixed forest type that includes lodgepole pine and aspen. Riparian habitat with willows and sedges are also located in the project area. Important migratory bird species likely to inhabit the area include prairie falcons, red-tail hawks, Williamson's sapsuckers, Clark's Nutcrackers, hermit thrushes, Coopers hawks, northern goshawks, and ruby-crowned kinglets. Other songbirds including several sparrows, mountain chickadees, and mountain bluebirds are also common in the area.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed spring development would improve livestock grazing distribution and management in allotment # 07530. Better livestock management would result in more suitable habitat for the species listed above. Grass and forb

cover would increase, thereby providing additional food, cover, and nest material for migratory birds. The Proposed Action would also provide an additional water source for birds and their prey base.

The No Action Alternative would maintain current livestock management. Grass productivity would remain as it currently exists and cover for ground nesting birds would not increase. No additional water for migratory birds would be available in the pasture as a result of this alternative.

THREATENED, ENDANGERED, AND SENSITIVE SPECIES (includes a finding on Standard 4)

Affected Environment: A list of threatened, endangered, and candidate species which could inhabit the proposed project area was received from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on February 27, 2007. The Proposed Action is located within the Colorado River basin. The USFWS has determined that any water depletion within the Colorado River likely jeopardizes the continued existence of the Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub, bonytail, and razorback sucker through destruction or adverse modification of their critical habitat.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The BLM completed a programmatic biological assessment (PBA) in 1994 to address small depletions to the Colorado River. In response to the BLM's PBA, the USFWS issued a Biological Opinion (BO) (#ES/GJ-6-CO-94-F-017) on June 13, 1994, which includes reasonable and prudent alternatives developed by the USFWS that allow the BLM to authorize projects that result in small water depletions while avoiding destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. The BLM's selected alternative is to make a one-time contribution to the Recovery Implementation Program in the amount equal to the average annual acre-feet depleted by each project.

The proposed spring development would deplete approximately 0.07 acre-ft. annually. The depletion would be submitted to the BLM Colorado State Office at the end of the fiscal year to be included in the annual statewide depletion.

No other listed species or BLM designated Sensitive Species are known to inhabit the project area.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: Allotment # 07530 was assessed for compliance with the Standards for Public Land Health during 2005 and determined to be meeting Standard 4. Neither the Proposed Action, nor the No Action Alternative would prevent the allotment from meeting this standard.

WATER QUALITY, SURFACE AND GROUND (includes a finding on Standard 5)

Affected Environment: The Proposed Action would develop a seep that is upstream from the intermittent Muller Creek, which flows into Ten Mile Creek, which is a tributary of the Fraser River. The state has designated these streams for coldwater aquatic life- class 1, recreation-class 1a, water supply, and agricultural uses. These stream segments are primarily on private lands and are not monitored by the BLM for water quality. There are no known water quality concerns, however, and the streams are considered to be fully supporting their designated uses. Water quality of the spring source has not been sampled.

Environmental Consequences: Under the Proposed Action, there would be minimal long term impacts to water quality. The development of the spring for livestock water would include an enclosure of the spring source. The enclosure would protect the ground water source from livestock and wildlife trampling, and would reduce the sources of contamination. By moving livestock to an upland water trough, overall water quality would be protected or improved.

Under the No Action Alternative, existing conditions would continue. The opportunity to protect the ground water quality and improve livestock distribution would be foregone.

The following mitigation is proposed to mitigate potential short term impacts during construction.

Mitigation:

-Disturbed areas should be kept to a minimum, equipment should not enter the wetland or seep area, and disturbed areas re-vegetated to prevent accelerated erosion.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: The Proposed Action would protect ground water quality for the long term by reducing livestock and wildlife trampling and use at the spring source. The No Action Alternative would not protect the spring source from animal use. Neither alternative would prevent the allotment from meeting this standard.

WETLANDS & RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)

Affected Environment: The proposed project has not been inventoried for wetland values. From looking at staff photographs, the spring source may not be jurisdictional, as it may not have the hydric soils and soil depth. From topographic maps and aerial photographs, it does not appear that the spring continues to a mapped drainage nor does it support a riparian zone. However, the Vegetation Section of this EA suggests a willow/sedge drainage exists. Conclusive determinations are not possible, however, without a field visit.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: Spring developments are a tool to help improve livestock distribution, protect the spring source and any associated wetlands, and help draw livestock out of riparian areas. Livestock are watered away from the spring source, which is protected by the enclosure. Outside of the grazing period, the water remains at the source and during the grazing period, excess water is returned to the spring's drainage.

The Proposed Action would minimize the disturbance associated with setting the collection box (<6 cubic feet) and laying the pipeline (generally ¾ to 1 inch width). There would be minimal long term impacts to the seep from the spring development.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps), by the authority of the Clean Water Act, issue permits for construction activities that may affect waters of the United States. In their "2007 Proposed Regional Conditions in Colorado", they have defined springs as "any location where ground water emanates from a point in the ground. For purposes of this regional condition, springs do not include seeps or other discharges which do not have a defined channel." All

nationwide permits are revoked for activities involving “springs” within 100 feet of the point of groundwater discharge.

The Kremmling Field Office has been working with the BLM’s State Office and the Corps to determine if an individual permit would be necessary to authorize the Proposed Action. At this point in time, the regional conditions have not been finalized. It appears that this spring would not require a permit, as the source would be characterized as a “seep”, as it oozes out of the ground, rather than flows with a hydraulic grade line above the ground surface. This would be verified with a field inspection as soon as conditions allow. The BLM will continue to work with the Corps to insure compliance to any applicable requirements. The Corps desires to see at least 50% of the water remain in the natural drainage, to lessen vegetative impacts from the development.

Under the No Action Alternative, livestock and wildlife would continue to water out of the spring, trampling the source area and any associated wetland.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The overall allotment was assessed for Land Health Standards and found to be meeting standards. The individual spring area was not specifically inventoried, but the Proposed Action would not hinder the spring’s ability to meet the standard and would benefit the overall landscape.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: The following non-critical elements were determined to be potentially impacted and were carried forward for analysis from the IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: Soil information is limited to the Grand County Soil Survey, which gives the general soil conditions in a larger area and is not project specific. The soils around the spring source would be expected to be a small inclusion and not necessarily similar to the surrounding mapped soil unit. The soils are mapped as Uinta sandy loams, 15-50% slopes that support a Woodland site, with the downslope soils being Youga loams, 15-45% slopes that support a Mountain loam range site.

Uinta soils were formed in glacial drift and weathered metamorphic rock, and tend to have moderate permeability, moderate plant available moisture, and medium runoff rates. The sandy loam surfaces are underlain by sandy clay loam to clay loam subsurfaces, and only with depth (>45") do gravels and cobbles make up more than 10% of the volume. Youga loams were also formed in glacial drift and colluvium, but tend to have finer textures than the Uintas. Permeabilities are moderately slow, plant available water is high, and surface runoff is medium. The loam surfaces are underlain by clay loam to gravelly clay loam soils, with only 5% coarse fragments by volume.

Environmental Consequences: Accessing the site, pipeline construction, and trough placement would have minor short terms impacts to soils. The proposed spring development would only require limited off-road travel to construct the development. Due to the small size of the seep, equipment would remain outside of the seep on upland soils for the collection box and pipeline trenching.

Soil disturbances would be limited to a fairly small area, and after the short term construction disturbance, would consist of the area around the trough. The overall, long term impact to the allotment would be improved livestock distribution, which would benefit watershed (and upland soils) health.

Under the No Action Alternative, the opportunity to improve overall soil condition would be foregone and the existing conditions would continue.

The following mitigation is proposed to mitigate potential short term impacts during construction.

Mitigation:

-Access and construction would be limited to periods of dry soil conditions. The pipeline route would be water barred if the slopes are steep and all disturbed upland soils would be reseeded.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: During the livestock permit renewal process, the interdisciplinary team determined the allotment was meeting the Standard for upland soils. The Proposed Action would disturb a small area and would help the allotment continue to meet the Standard and protect long term soil health. The No Action Alternative would continue the existing conditions.

RANGE MANAGEMENT:

Affected Environment: Allotment # 07530 (Linke) has an authorized grazing preference of 48 Animal Unit Months (AUMs) on the 280 acres of BLM-administered public land within the allotment. There is also 1,190 acres of private land with a grazing preference of 180 AUMs. The entire allotment is grazed by 72 cattle from 6/1 through 9/15 each year.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: Development of Baker Spring would provide an additional source of livestock and wildlife water in a section of the allotment that receives reduced use by cattle because of the lack of easily attainable water. The Proposed Action would remedy this situation by providing an additional water source for livestock and wildlife. The Proposed Action would result in better livestock distribution throughout the allotment and more even use of the vegetation.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The spring is located within a small patch of mixed coniferous and deciduous trees with a dense understory of grasses and forbs. However, the spring area is devoid of vegetation because it is too wet to support vegetative growth. Below the spring area, the vegetation consists of mostly native cool season grasses, and desirable annual and perennial forbs with a few scattered shrubs. At the proposed water trough location, there is dense cool season, perennial grasses and forbs with a broken canopy of aspen trees and a few junipers. The natural drainage supports a dense stand of willows with sedges and rushes along the drainage edge.

Willows are growing along the natural drainage that would need to be crossed by the pipeline to get the water to where a water trough could be installed that is easily accessible to livestock and wildlife. The water trough would be located in an open area, if possible, to minimize impacts to the aspens and willows in the area.

The vegetation in the development area includes a mix of lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*) and quaking aspen trees (*Populus tremuloides*) with an understory of grasses. The lodgepole pine trees in the area are heavily infested by the Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) and most trees over about 7 inches in diameter are dead or dying.

Environmental Consequences: Installation of the proposed project would disturb the vegetation in the spring area, along the pipeline route, and at the location of the water trough. All areas would require leveling and re-seeding following construction. A BLM approved seed mix would be required for the reseeded. The livestock grazing permittee would be responsible for constructing an enclosure fence around the spring box in 2007 or 2008. The enclosure would protect the spring from damage and preserve its integrity.

Some trees may need to be felled to develop the spring and install the pipeline. The following mitigation and monitoring is proposed to mitigate potential short term impacts during construction.

Mitigation:

-A BLM approved seed mix would be required for the reseeding.

-Periodic monitoring of the vegetation would be required following project construction to ensure the seeded vegetation becomes established. If the seeding fails, reseeding would be required with the same or an alternative seed mix. Once an adequate stand of the intended vegetation is established, monitoring should no longer be required.

-Any felled trees would be limbed and bucked to lengths not to exceed eight feet. Slash will be lopped and scattered to a depth not to exceed 24 inches.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Allotment # 07530 (Linke) was assessed for compliance with the Standards for Public Land Health during the 2005 livestock grazing permit renewal process. The BLM interdisciplinary team concluded the Allotment is in compliance with Standard # 3 (Upland Vegetation).

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, black bears, coyotes, bobcats, mountain lions, and blue grouse are residents of the proposed project area. Deer and elk will reside in the area until deep snow makes forage vegetation unavailable. Black bear, coyotes, bobcats, badgers and mountain lions are yearlong residents. Rabbits and several other species of rodents are also year long residents of the proposed project area.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed spring development would provide an additional water source for elk, mule deer, and small mammals during the summer season as well as improve livestock distribution during the grazing season. The change in livestock distribution would improve forage conditions and provide additional food and cover vegetation for wildlife using the allotment.

The No Action Alternative would not improve livestock grazing distribution and would not provide an additional water source for wildlife. If the No Action Alternative is implemented, forage for wildlife in the allotment would remain the same.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): Allotment # 07530 was assessed for compliance with the Standards for Public Land Health during 2005 and determined to be meeting Standard 3. Neither the Proposed Action, nor the No Action Alternative would prevent the allotment from meeting this standard. The Proposed Action would likely improve this standard for terrestrial wildlife.

WATER RIGHTS:

Affected Environment: The proposed spring development has not been inventoried for flows. Without a field inventory, it is impossible to determine if there are surface flows to Muller Creek.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: Once the seep is developed, the BLM would measure the flow and file for a water right in the Colorado Water Court. Water rights are

administered by the state and the BLM would be subject to the appropriation doctrine and all senior water rights. The BLM's use of the seep could not impact senior water rights under state law. If the No Action Alternative is selected, the BLM would attempt to estimate the flow from the seep and would also file for a water right.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed project area is located in an area classified as VRM Class II in the KRO 1984 Resource Management Plan. The objective of VRM Class II is to retain the existing characteristic landscape. The level of change in any of the basic landscape elements (line, form, color, texture) due to management activities should be low and not evident. The vegetation surrounding the project is made up of Willow, Alder, Aspen and Grass/forbs/shrub habitat.

Environmental Consequences: The introduction of the metal fence posts, fence wire and water trough may be visible from portions of the primitive road. The tree/grass habitat would screen the development. Limiting disturbance with the backhoe, re-vegetating disturbed areas, and stockpiling and reusing topsoil would mitigate the majority of the new impacts. The following mitigation is proposed to mitigate potential short term impacts during construction and long term impacts after construction. If implemented, VRM Class II objectives would be met.

Mitigation:

-The color of the water tank (i.e. green or tan) should be used to help it to blend with the vegetation.

-Any facilities on the site should use natural appearing materials and colors that have low reflectivity to blend with the site.

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed spring development is located in the Middle Park formation, the Windy Gap Volcanic member. This geologic member is classified as Class III, which indicates that fossils of poor quality (fragmentary or poorly preserved) are found in this formation.

Environmental Consequences: No further work is recommended for this project because the potential for impacts is low.

Mitigation:

-Should fossils be discovered during development of the spring, pipeline and/or trough locations, work would stop and the staff paleontologist would be immediately notified so that he may observe, document and evaluate the discovery(s).

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: All resource values have been evaluated for cumulative impacts. It has been determined that there would be no cumulative impacts.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED: Sandy Baker, Livestock Grazing Permittee

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: See IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

FONSI

CO-120-2006-13-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

DECISION RECORD

DECISION: It is my decision to authorize the Proposed Action as described in the attached EA. This decision is contingent on meeting all mitigation measures and monitoring requirements listed below.

RATIONALE: The purpose of the Proposed Action was to provide an additional water source for the livestock grazing in allotment # 07530 (Linke). This project was needed to provide better distribution of livestock throughout the allotment and more even utilization of the vegetation within the allotment.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Invasive Non-native Species:

-The disturbance associated with the installation of the pipeline and spring box will require reseeded with a BLM approved seed mix to re-establish native vegetation and reduce the chance of establishment or spread of invasive, non-native species.

Water Quality/ Surface and Ground:

-Disturbed areas must be kept to a minimum, equipment must not enter the wetland or seep area, and disturbed areas must be re-vegetated to prevent accelerated erosion.

Soils:

-Access and construction must be limited to periods of dry soil conditions. The pipeline route must be water barred if the slopes are steep and all disturbed upland soils must be reseeded.

Vegetation:

-A BLM approved seed mix will be required for the reseeded.

-Any felled trees must be limbed and bucked to lengths not to exceed eight feet. Slash must be lopped and scattered to a depth not to exceed 24 inches.

Visual Resources:

-The color of the water tank (i.e. green or tan) must be used to help it to blend with the vegetation.

-Any facilities on the site must use natural appearing materials and colors that have low reflectivity to blend with the site.

Paleontology:

-Should fossils be discovered during development of the spring, pipeline and/or trough locations, work must stop and the staff paleontologist must be immediately notified so that he may observe, document and evaluate the discovery(s).

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING:

Invasive Non-native Species:

-Periodic monitoring will be required following completion of the project to ensure weeds do not become established within the project area. If weeds do become established it will be the responsibility of the permittee to report the location of the weeds. The BLM, in partnership with Grand County, will be responsible for control of the invasive, non-native species.

Vegetation:

-Periodic monitoring of the vegetation will be required following project construction to ensure the seeded vegetation becomes established. If the seeding fails, reseeded will be required with the same or an alternative seed mix. Once an adequate stand of the intended vegetation is established, monitoring will no longer be required.

NAME OF PREPARER: Richard Johnson

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 5/29/07

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: /s/ Peter McFadden

DATE SIGNED: 5/30/07

ATTACHMENTS:

1). Project Map

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1 – Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Review Record and Checklist

Appendix 1

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS REVIEW RECORD AND CHECKLIST:

Project Title: Baker Spring Development
Project Leader: Richard Johnson
Date Submitted for Comment: 2/26/2007
Due Date for Comments: 4/15/2007

Need for a field Exam: Various specialists visited the site during the past two years.

Scoping Needs/Interested or Affected Publics: See Interdisciplinary Review section.

Consultation/Permit Requirements:

Consultation	Date Initiated	Date Completed	Responsible Specialist/ Contractor	Comments
Cultural/Archeological Clearance/SHPO		5/16/07	Bill B. Wyatt	No effect, no historic properties affected.
Native American		5/16/07	Bill B. Wyatt	No effect, no TCP's affected
T&E Species/FWS	N/A	N/A	M. McGuire	Consultation was completed for Colorado River species by a Programmatic BA in 1994. (Depletion will be reported in 11/07 per BA).
Permits Needed (i.e. Air or Water)	2/28/07		P. Belcher	If necessary, 404 Compliance will be completed prior to construction. Field inspection still necessary. A water rights filing will be made by the BLM once a flow is measured.

(NP) = Not Present

(NI) = Resource/Use Present but Not Impacted

(PI) = Potentially Impacted and Brought Forward for Analysis.

NP NI PI	Discipline/Name		Date Review Comp.	Initials	Review Comments (required for Critical Element NIs, and for elements that require a finding but are not carried forward for analysis.)
CRITICAL ELEMENTS					
NI	Air Quality	Belcher	4/09/07	PB	Air quality is considered to be in compliance with National Standards. No impacts from the proposed action.
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Stout	5/29/07	JS	There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NI	Cultural Resources	Wyatt	5/16/07	BBW	No effect, no historic properties affected. If during excavation cultural artifacts or bone is located, the KFO Archaeologist would be notified and work would be stopped in that area.
NP	Environmental Justice	Stout	5/29/07	JS	According to the most recent Census Bureau statistics (2000), there are no minority or low

				income communities within the Kremmling Planning Area.	
NP	Farmlands, Prime and Unique	Belcher	4/09/07	PB	There are no farmlands, prime or unique, in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NP	Floodplains	Belcher	4/09/07	PB	The Proposed Action is not located in or adjacent to a floodplain.
PI	Invasive, Non-native Species	Johnson	3/21/07	RJ	See analysis in EA.
PI	Migratory Birds	McGuire	4/5/07	MM	See analysis in EA.
NI	Native American Religious Concerns	Wyatt	5/16/07	BBW	No concerns have been identified by any of the five tribes consulted, thus there would be no impacts to TCP's.
PI	T/E, and Sensitive Species (Finding on Standard 4)	McGuire	4/5/07	MM	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wastes, Hazardous and Solid	Johnson	3/21/07	RJ	There are no known hazardous or solid wastes located on BLM-administered lands in the proposed project area, and there would be no hazardous wastes generated as a result of the Proposed Action or No Action alternative.
PI	Water Quality, Surface and Ground (Finding on Standard 5)	Belcher	4/16/07	PB	See analysis in EA.
PI	Wetlands & Riparian Zones (Finding on Standard 2)	Belcher	4/16/07	PB	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Sterin	3/1/07	BS	An Eligibility study was completed in March 2007. There would be no impacts to any eligible segments from the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative.
NP	Wilderness	Monkouski	4/23/07	JM	There is no designated Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS (A finding must be made for these elements)					
PI	Soils (Finding on Standard 1)	Belcher	4/16/07	PB	See analysis in EA.
PI	Vegetation (Finding on Standard 3)	Johnson	3/21/07	RJ	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wildlife, Aquatic (Finding on Standard 3)	McGuire	4/5/07	MM	Finding: N/A, there are no aquatic wildlife present within the project area.
PI	Wildlife, Terrestrial (Finding on Standard 3)	McGuire	4/5/07	MM	See analysis in EA.
OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS					
NI	Access/Transportation	Monkouski	4/23/07	JM	There would be no impacts because this area has minimal public access. Any disturbance to the existing route would be over a small period of time.
NI	Forest Management	Rosene	3/16/07	RR	No impacts. Minimal disturbance of forest. See Vegetation section.
NI	Geology and Minerals	Hodgson	4/20/07	KH	No impacts.
PI	Hydrology/Water Rights	Belcher	4/16/07	PB	See analysis in EA.
NI	Paleontology	Rupp	5/30/07	FGR	No known impacts to paleontological resources.
NI	Noise	Monkouski	4/23/07	JM	No impacts.
PI	Range Management	Johnson	3/21/07	RJ	See analysis in EA.
NI	Lands/ Realty Authorizations	Cassel	1/12/07	SC	No leases or permits in the location of the Proposed Action. There is a ROW to William Linke for a road that would not be impacted by the Proposed Action.
NI	Recreation	Monkouski	4/23/07	JM	No impacts. This area has minimal public

					access.
NI	Socio-Economics	Stout	5/29/07	JS	There would be no socio-economic impacts from the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative.
PI	Visual Resources	Straub	4/16/07	RS	See analysis in EA.
NI	Cumulative Impact Summary	Stout	5/29/07	JS	There would be no cumulative impacts.
FINAL REVIEW					
	P&E Coordinator	Stout	5/30/07	JS	
	Field Manager	Ruhs			