

**APPENDIX A:**  
INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD

---

## INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD

**Project Title:** Dawson Geophysical Company's Coyote Basin 3-D Geophysical Project

**NEPA Log Number:** UT-080-2004-0294

**File/Serial Number:** NA

**Project Leader:** Veronica Herksahn

**FOR EAs:** NP: not present; NI: resource/use present but not impacted; PI: potentially impacts

**FOR DNAs only:** NC: no change (anticipated resource impacts not changed from those analyzed in the NEPA document on which the DNA is based)

### STAFF REVIEW OF PROPOSAL:

NP/NI/PI NC	Resource	Date Reviewed	Signature	Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs. PIs require further analysis.)
<b>CRITICAL ELEMENTS</b>				
NI	Air Quality	8/16/04	<i>Jan Nitschke Anuclear</i>	Air quality in Uintah County is in compliance with federal and state ambient air quality standards. The proposed action and alternatives would not affect air quality because activities would be short-term in any given location, no construction/earth moving would occur, and vehicles and construction equipment would be kept properly tuned to minimize emissions. No Permits or authorizations from the State of Utah, Division of Air Quality would be required.
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern			
PI	Cultural Resources	8/17/04	<i>H.B. Phillips</i>	1. Direct impacts to cultural sites. See Section 4.2.1.2.
NI	Environmental Justice	8/16/04	<i>Jan Nitschke Anuclear</i>	No minority or low-income populations are present within the vicinity of the proposed project area.
NP	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)			
PI	Floodplains	8-16-04	<i>K. Wright</i>	1. Impacts to floodplain functions. See Section 4.2.1.5. 2. Impacts to banks of Coyote Wash. See Section 4.2.1.5.
NI	Invasive, Non-native Species	8-17-04	<i>T. J. [Signature]</i>	The Proposed Action or No Action Alternative would not affect the introduction of invasive non-native species because the operator would power wash all equipment prior to use in the project area to minimize the potential for introduction of invasive non-native species seeds. Surface effects would be limited, thus minimizing the possible spread of any non-native species already in the project area.
PI	Native American Religious Concerns	08/17/04	<i>H.B. Phillips</i>	1. Impacts to Native American religious concerns. See Section 4.2.1.3.
PI	Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate Species and Sensitive Species	8-17-04 8-17-04	<i>T. J. [Signature] T. J. [Signature]</i>	1. Impacts to TESS plants and their habitat. See Section 4.2.1.3. 2. Impacts to TESS animals and their habitat. See Section 4.2.1.3.

NP/NI/PI NC	Resource	Date Reviewed	Signature	Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs. PIs require further analysis.)
NI	Wastes (hazardous or solid)			No chemicals subject to SARA Title III in amounts greater than 10,000 pounds would be used. No extremely hazardous substances as defined in 40 CFR. 355 in threshold planning quantities would be used.
NI	Water Quality	8-16-04 8/17/04	Kault & Wright (Groundwater) John Mayers (ground water)	The Proposed Action would not affect water resources. Setback distances would be imposed between shot holes and water resources. In addition, subsurface detonation of explosives would leave a benign residual of gases and solids--water/steam, carbon dioxide gas, nitrogen gas, calcium carbonate solid, and sodium carbonate gas. No surface water depletions from the Upper Colorado River would occur due to use of other non-depleting sources.
NI	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	8-16-04	Kault & Wright	All wetlands and riparian zones would be avoided by 300 ft and no drilling or shooting would occur within 500 ft of a flowing stream.
NI	Wild and Scenic Rivers *	8/17/04	Jan Nitschke for Brian Tucker	No wild or scenic rivers occur in the proposed project area, and none would be affected by the proposed project.
NP	Wilderness			
<b>OTHER RESOURCES / CONCERNS*</b>				
NI	Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines #	8/17/04	Jan Nitschke for Brian Tucker	The proposed action and alternatives would not measurably affect water, nutrients, or energy system flows because of the very small disturbance area as well as the applicant-committed environmental practices designed to minimize disturbance to soils, vegetation, water resources, wetlands/riparian zones, and existing facilities, and to minimize the potential for the introduction of invasive non-native species.
NI	Livestock Grazing *	8/17/04	Jan Nitschke for Brian Tucker	The Proposed Action would not result in a reduction in AUMs, and all stock control features such as fences, gates, and cattle guards would be maintained and repaired to pre-project conditions following completion of the seismic surveys.
NP	Woodland / Forestry			
PI	Vegetation			1. Direct impacts to native vegetation. See Section 4.2.1.8.
PI	Wildlife Resources	8-17-04	Ed Stone	1. Impacts to pronghorn, prairie dogs, raptors, and migratory birds. See Section 4.2.1.9.
PI	Soils *	8/17/04	Jan Nitschke for Brian Tucker	1. Increased wind and water erosion. See Section 4.2.1.7. 2. Lack of reclamation success. See Section 4.2.1.7. 3. Impacts to biological soil crusts. See Section 4.2.1.7.
PI	Recreation	8-17-04	Kim Banta	1. Reductions in recreation opportunity and experience. See Section 4.2.1.8. 2. Impacts to Fantasy Canyon. See Section 4.2.1.8.
NI	Visual Resources	8-17-04	Kim Banta	The alternatives would not violate existing VRM classifications because the level of change to the existing landscape would be minimal and short-term.
NI	Geology / Mineral Resources	8/17/04	Ed Stone	There would be no impacts to geologic or mineral resources.
NI	Lands / Access	8/17/04	R/B	No BLM ROW would be required.
NI	Fuels/Fire Management	8-18-04	Steve Hays	Appropriate measures would be taken to prevent fires, as required by the BLM.

NP/NI/PI NC	Resource	Date Reviewed	Signature	Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs. PIs require further analysis.)
PI	Paleontology	8/17/04	John Mayers	1. Disturbance/destruction of significant paleontological materials. See Section 4.2.1.6. Mitigation/recommendations are OK as per report 8/16/04.
NP	Wild Horses and Burros *	8/17/04	Jen Nitschke - Analyst for Del Clark	Wild horses and burros are not present in the proposed project area.
PI	Lands Having Wilderness Characteristics *	8/17/04	Jen Nitschke - Analyst for Susan de Paige	1. Impacts to wilderness characteristics. See Section 4.2.1.9.

**FINAL REVIEW:**

Reviewer Title	Date	Signature	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	8.17.04	Ughuekhan	
Manager	8/17/04	Jen Nitschke - (Analyst)	

**NOTE:** Review Comments should include information explaining how the specialist came to their conclusion - how does he/she know the element/resource is not present (site visit and date of visit, familiarity with location, etc.). For all 'NIs' give a brief explanation as to why that element/resource would not be impacted.

\* This list of Other Resources / Concerns to be considered may vary by individual field office. Note: Native American Trust Responsibilities should be considered for FO's with Indian Mineral interests.

\* Reviewers not present for signature; however have been involved in scoping, providing input & review