

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-120-2007-44-EA

PROJECT NAME: North Park Greater Sage-grouse Ponds

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 9 N. R. 80 W. Sec. 14, 26

APPLICANT: BLM/Colorado Division of Wildlife/North Park Greater Sage-grouse Working Group

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction/Issues and Concerns: Greater Sage-grouse have been identified as a high priority for management by the BLM in Colorado as well as in other states where they occur. Recent large scale declines in Greater sage-grouse populations throughout their historic range have prompted federal land management agencies and state wildlife management agencies to intensively manage habitat and populations to reverse this downward trend. Jackson County (North Park) supports a stable population of sage-grouse and the Kremmling Field Office (KFO), in concert with the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW) and the North Park Greater Sage-Grouse Working Group (NPGSWG), have formed a partnership to implement habitat improvement projects which are designed to benefit sage-grouse as well as other sagebrush ecosystem dependent wildlife species. Water and wetland habitat are important components of sage-grouse habitat and are in short supply in the drier sagebrush expanses of North Park. The BLM, CDOW, and the NPSGWG have agreed that small water impoundments would benefit sage-grouse as well as other wildlife and domestic livestock.

Proposed Action: The Proposed Action is to build two small water retention ponds and rebuild an old one which has eroded to the extent it no longer holds water. These structures would be constructed in mostly dry drainages with flow water during the wet seasons and would likely hold water from spring through mid summer (see Attachment #1 for project map). Small dams would be constructed across the drainages to catch and retain water from runoff. Earthen fill material for the structures would come from upstream of each site and below elevations of the high water lines. This water would be available for use by sage-grouse, pronghorn, waterbirds, and livestock. Eventually, wetland vegetation would establish in the ponds and would provide brood habitat for sage-grouse and waterfowl. Each of the three proposed structures would be approximately 60-feet long and dam heights would vary from 10' to 15'. Each dam would be built with an emergency spillway and would be

designed to hold no more than 10 acre feet of water when full. The structures would be constructed by BLM's Engineering Field Office construction equipment and operators. Construction would take place during the late summer of 2007, and each structure would be seeded during the fall of 2007.

No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative would be to not construct the proposed structures. Habitat for sage-grouse and other species would not be improved since additional water and wetland habitat would not be available in currently dry sagebrush dominated uplands.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE ACTION: The purpose of the project is to improve habitat for Greater Sage-grouse in the proposed project area by providing an additional source of water. There is a need for the Proposed Action because Greater Sage-grouse populations have been declining throughout their historic habitat. In addition, water and wetland habitat are important components of sage-grouse habitat and are in short supply in the drier sagebrush expanses of North Park.

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: Decision 5.a., page 8

Decision Language: Manage public land habitat to support optimum wildlife population levels as determined by the Colorado Division of Wildlife's Strategic Plan. Emphasis will be placed on intensively managing critical and important habitats including 326,000 acres of uplands, 3 miles of riparian, 3,000 acres of wetlands, and 53 miles of stream. All threatened and endangered plant and wildlife habitats will be protected as required by law and regulation.

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 Endangered Species	Special status, threatened and endangered species (federal and state), and other plants and 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, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Cultural Resources, Environmental Justice, Farmlands, Prime and Unique, Native American Religious Concerns, Wastes, Hazardous or Solid, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Air Quality, Floodplains and Wilderness 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: There is no known invasive, non-native species (noxious weeds) growing in the project area. However, any soil or vegetation disturbing activities provide an avenue for the establishment or expansion of invasive, non-native species.

Environmental Consequences: The Proposed Action would include small areas of disturbance associated with the ponds. These areas of disturbance would be susceptible to the invasion or spread of invasive, non-native species.

Since construction equipment is a common pathway for the importation of noxious weed seeds into an area, mitigation is proposed to reduce the potential for direct impacts. The BLM would monitor the project area for the establishment or spread of invasive, non-native species after the project is completed. If invasive, non-native species become established or spread as a result of the Proposed Action; BLM would be responsible for their control.

Mitigation:

-Construction equipment should be cleaned prior to entering the project area.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The proposed project sites provide habitat for a variety of migratory songbirds including sage thrasher, Brewer's sparrow, sage sparrow, green-tailed towhee, and vesper sparrow. Red-tailed hawks and kestrels also inhabit the three proposed pond sites. These species are dependent on the sagebrush ecosystem and the three proposed ponds all occur in the sagebrush/grassland habitat sites.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed project would eliminate a small amount of sagebrush (less than 1/5 of an acre) habitat since sagebrush plants would be removed to build the earthen ponds. This habitat would be replaced by wetlands if the proposed ponds catch and retain water as they are designed to do. The wetland vegetation and available water would benefit numerous species of migratory birds since the proposed ponds are located in dry areas with adjoining vegetation dominated by sagebrush/grasslands. Some waterfowl could use the proposed ponds during the period water is available in them. The No Action Alternative would not increase wetland vegetation or open water in areas currently dry with little wetland vegetation available for use by migratory birds.

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

Affected Environment: The proposed project would remove some sagebrush/grassland vegetation which is currently used by Greater Sage-grouse, a BLM designated Sensitive Species. Several strutting grounds are located in the proposed project area and sage-grouse use the project area for nesting and early brood rearing habitat as well as breeding on the leks. Due to the lack of water and wetland vegetation, sage-grouse leave the proposed project area in search of wetland habitat where insects are plentiful for sage-grouse chicks. Insects are a critical source of protein for young sage-grouse and paramount to their survival as they grow to flight age in late summer and early fall.

The Proposed Action is located within the North Platte River basin, which is tributary to the Platte River System. The USFWS has determined that any water depletion within the Platte River jeopardizes the continued existence of one or more federally-listed threatened or endangered species and adversely modifies or destroys designated and proposed critical habitat. Depletions may affect and are likely to adversely affect the whooping crane, the interior least tern, the piping plover, and the pallid sturgeon in Nebraska. In the fall of 2006, an agreement was signed between the governors of Colorado, Nebraska, and Wyoming and the U.S. Secretary of the Interior to implement a basin-wide Platte River Recovery Implementation Program. The Program will provide ESA compliance for water users in the Platte River basin for effects on the target species and habitat, and went into effect on January 1, 2007.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed ponds would remove a small amount of sagebrush habitat which is currently used by sage-grouse. However, the ponds would provide a source of water and wetland vegetation for brood habitat for young sage-grouse. The amount of sagebrush habitat lost would not impact sage-grouse since a sufficient amount to support nesting and early brood rearing would remain in the project area.

The Proposed Action would represent a maximum yearly depletion of 30 acre-ft/year, assuming each pond would fill completely with runoff and that their maximum volume is 10 acre-ft. each. It appears that the ponds do not have a groundwater source, so a one-time fill/year in the dry relatively flat terrain is over-estimating the depletion. A programmatic biological opinion was completed on June 16, 2006, that covers new depletions, but the exact reasonable and prudent alternatives for federal depletions from new projects is still being determined. The BLM would comply with the reasonable and prudent alternatives once the USFWS determines them.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The area would continue to meet this land health standard if the propose project is implemented.

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

Affected Environment: The two northern proposed pond sites lie within the “North Platte River Above Three Way” 5th order watershed and the most southern site is located within the “Illinois River” 5th Order watershed. The southern site is located about 1.25 miles west of Walden Reservoir. Due to the flat arid terrain, the small drainage is probably tributary to the reservoir only during snowmelt. The two northern sites are also within ephemeral/intermittent drainages that are approximately 3.8 miles from the North Platte River’s floodplain. Due to the

flat arid terrain and the distance, little runoff would be expected to reach the floodplain. Any runoff that did reach the floodplain would be intercepted by the Boone Ditch and would be unlikely to reach the river itself. There are no water quality concerns for Walden Reservoir or this segment of the North Platte River, and they are considered to be fully supporting their designated uses.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: Due to their small size and distance from perennial surface waters, the proposed ponds would have no measurable impact on water quality in the North Platte River or Walden Reservoir. The ponds would retain the runoff's sediment load, but it is generally not tributary to perennial water. They would also provide seasonal water to the surrounding area thereby potentially improving the livestock distribution in the allotment and the overall watershed condition. The ponds are located in soils that tend to have high salt contents. As the ponds would evaporate, salts in the soils would be drawn to the surface and deposited, sometimes creating "slickspots" too saline for vegetation. A depression downstream of the ponds was sampled for water quality and had a high electrical conductivity. The water's chemistry was dominated by Sodium Bicarbonate. Similar ponds within the park also tend to have saline waters, but generally within livestock and waterfowl tolerances. The Proposed Action would have no impacts on ground water quality.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: The ponds would be located in allotments that are meeting the Standard for water quality. The Proposed Action could help the allotments continue to meet the standard by protecting watershed conditions. The small ponds may develop saline water, but would not impact perennial water sources.

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

Affected Environment: The proposed ponds are located in ephemeral/intermittent drainages that do not have ground water contacts or water tables to support wetlands. There are limited rush/sedge communities within the proposed pond sites, but upland vegetation dominates the sites.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed ponds have the potential to retain runoff and create the soil moisture necessary to allow wetland species to move in and establish with time. Under the No Action Alternative, no earthen impoundments would be built and the drainages would continue to function as before and provide little to no wetland values.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: The area is limited in wetland values due to the soils and the amount of water. By constructing the impoundments, the proposed areas may be able to support wetland habitat. Under the No Action Alternative, an opportunity to create wetland habitat would be foregone.

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 in the Jackson County Soil Survey maps the general area as mostly Spicerton sandy loam, 0-5% slopes. These soils formed in alluvial sediment from the Coalmont Formation. They are found on low terraces and upland drainage ways. The pale brown sandy loam surface layer is about two inches thick. The subsoil is brown clay about ten inches thick. The underlying material is brown clay. Salts efficient to affect plant growth have accumulated in the lower subsoil and underlying material. Permeability is slow, with moderate plant available moisture due to salt content

Environmental Consequences: Due to the small sizes of the ponds, the proposed construction would disturb only the immediate area of the ponds. The surface soils and vegetation should be scraped off from the excavation area and stockpiled, so that only clay soils are used in the embankment. The soil survey rates the Spicerton soils as difficult to compact when used in embankments and compressible (“excessive decrease in volume of soft soil under load”). The older embankment appears to have failed due to having no spillway design and poor compaction. The proposed structures should have a core trench and be constructed in a series of soil lifts, each one having good compaction. The proposed spillway and construction specifications must be in accordance with Colorado Revised Statute 35-49-101- Livestock Water Tank Act of Colorado as administered by the State Engineer’s Office. Prior to construction, an application for each structure must be approved by the state.

Mitigation:

-The surface soils and vegetation should be scraped off from the excavation area and stockpiled, so that only clay soils are used in the embankment.

-The proposed structures should have a core trench and be constructed in a series of soil lifts, each one having good compaction.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: The proposed ponds would not affect the allotments’ ability to meet the Standard and may help distribute livestock within the allotments. Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to soils.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The proposed project is located in allotments # 07172, # 07116, and # 07073. The vegetation associated within these allotments is a mixture of sagebrush with an understory of cool season grasses and forbs. Some common grass plants found in the area are Poa species, Stipa species and Fescue species.

Environmental Consequences: Under the Proposed Action, the ponds would be created by using a bull-dozer that would initially disturb the soil and vegetation. After the initial disturbance, native vegetation would reclaim the dams and the disturbed areas around the pond. Under the No Action Alternative, vegetation would not be disturbed.

Mitigation:

-If native vegetation does not reclaim the ponds, then seeding the pond would be needed.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): In 2005, allotment # 07172, # 07116, and # 07073 were assessed for Standards. The allotments passed standard 3 (vegetation). The proposed ponds would not affect the allotments' ability to meet the Standard

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: No aquatic habitat exists in the proposed project area. However, the proposed project would provide aquatic habitat if implemented as proposed.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed project would provide aquatic habitat if implemented as planned; waterfowl and shorebirds would benefit. Breeding and brood rearing habitat for mallards, gadwalls, killdeers, and avocets would be created if the proposed project is implemented. The No Action Alternative would not provide aquatic habitat in an area that is normally dry.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The project area would continue to meet this standard if the proposed project is implemented.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The proposed project area is inhabited by pronghorn, coyotes, badgers, Richardson's ground squirrels, and several other species of rodents. Pronghorn use the proposed project during all seasons except winter while the other species are yearlong residents. As discussed earlier in this report, the proposed project sites are dominated by sagebrush/grassland habitat.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The proposed project would remove some sagebrush, grass, and forbs at the project sites. A sufficient quantity of sagebrush/grassland exists in the proposed project area to provide habitat to support the upland wildlife species which currently use the area. The proposed project would provide three additional sources of water for the species listed above and overtime, wetland vegetation as well. Available water is limited in the project area so any additional water would benefit the wildlife species that inhabit the uplands adjoining the pond sites. The No Action Alternative would not provide additional water sources or wetland vegetation, both which would improve habitat for a variety of upland wildlife.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The area would continue meet this public land health standard if the proposed projects are implemented as proposed.

RANGE MANAGEMENT

Affected Environment: The existing pond is known as Shote Hole Reservoir and is located in allotment # 07172. The project was built in 1955 with no known maintenance. Livestock would be grazing this allotment during May and June. The new proposed ponds would be grazed during May, June, and July. These ponds are located in allotments # 07116 and # 07073.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: Under the Proposed Action, the ponds would be developed to provide habitat for sage-grouse by creating wetland vegetation. The new ponds would also create additional water for livestock and other wildlife in the area. Unless fenced out from cattle, livestock would congregate around the ponds if they have water. This would allow cattle to graze the vegetation around the ponds.

Under the No Action Alternative, the ponds would not be built and additional livestock water sources would not be available in allotments # 07073, # 07116 and # 07172.

HYDROLOGY/WATER RIGHTS:

Affected Environment: The proposed ponds are located within a shallow basin near the center of North Park that has several small depressions with seasonal water. The water appears to be from precipitation events, and not necessarily associated with a more perennial water table or ground water source. The drainage areas for each pond are 766.4 acres for the north pond, 99 acres for the middle pond, and 276.2 acres for the south pond. Using the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) Curve Number and/or the Rational method, average snowmelt could produce possible runoff amounts ranging from 0.52 acre-ft. (middle pond) to 4.0 acre-ft (north pond), with peak flows ranging from 1.7 cfs – 13.6 cfs.

The North Park basin is considered to be over appropriated. In the winter of 2007, the BLM approached the Division of Water Resources on how these ponds might be administered, especially as there is a water right below the public lands. Due to the difficulty of locating augmentation water to off-set the BLM's water use, the state advised the BLM to use the Livestock Water Tank application. This would register the ponds with the state and protect the ponds from future water filings impacting their ability to fill. It does not, however, represent a water right. If a downstream call is placed, the state may request the ponds be breached (especially since there are no outlet pipes) to release any stored water. The BLM could maintain that that the smaller pond's breaching would be unlikely to result in water reaching the North Platte, and be exempt from breaching.

Environmental Consequences/Mitigation: The Bureau of Land Management has applied for state permits for the three ponds as Livestock Water Tanks. The state administers these permits, and construction and operation of these ponds would follow state laws and regulations. There would be no water rights filed on for these ponds at this time, and no other water right holders could be impacted by the ponds' storage.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: For the purpose of this EA, the general geographic boundary for cumulative impact analysis is North Park. The Kremmling Field Office is divided north to south by the Continental Divide. The public lands to the north of the divide are generally referred to as North Park, and those to the south of the divide, Middle Park. There are approximately 186,709 acres of BLM-administered public lands in North Park.

In looking at past actions within the geographic area over the past ten years, there have not been any major changes to the BLM-administered public lands in North Park, as well as the other private, state, and federal land in Jackson County. In looking at reasonably foreseeable actions, there has been increased interest in oil and gas leasing in Jackson County which could have future impacts on Greater sage-grouse populations. However, as stated earlier in the document, the North Park Greater sage-grouse populations have remained stable in recent years. Since water and wetland habitat are important components of sage-grouse habitat and are in short supply in the drier sagebrush expanses of North Park, the Proposed Action would have a minor beneficial cumulative impact to the overall sage-grouse population in North Park.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED: Kirk Snyder, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Richard Vail, Ducks Unlimited, and Erin Light and Sue Petersmann, Colorado Division of Water Resources, Division 6

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: See IDT-RRC in Appendix 1.

FONSI

CO-120-2007-44-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 construction of the ponds will improve habitat for Greater Sage-grouse in the proposed project area by providing an additional source of water. Water and wetland habitat are important components of sage-grouse habitat and are in short supply in the drier sagebrush expanses of North Park.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

Cultural/Paleontological:

The holder shall immediately bring to the attention of the Authorized Officer any and all antiquities, or other objects of historic, paleontological, or scientific interest including but not limited to, historic or prehistoric ruins or artifacts DISCOVERED as a result of operations under this authorization (16 U.S.C. 470.-3, 36 CFR 800.112). The holder shall immediately suspend all activities in the area of the object and shall leave such discoveries intact until written approval to proceed is obtained from the Authorized Officer. Approval to proceed will be based upon evaluation of the object(s). Evaluation shall be by a qualified professional selected by the Authorized Officer from a Federal agency insofar as practicable (BLM Manual 8142.06E). When not practicable, the holder shall bear the cost of the services of a non-Federal professional.

Within five working days the Authorized Officer will inform the holder as to:

- Whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places;
- The mitigation measures the holder will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary); and,
- A timeframe for the Authorized Officer to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800.11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the Authorized Officer are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the holder wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the Authorized Officer will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the holder will be responsible for mitigation costs. The Authorized Officer will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the Authorized Officer that the required mitigation has been completed, the holder will then be allowed to resume construction.

Antiquities, historic, prehistoric ruins, paleontological or objects of scientific interest that are outside of the authorization boundaries but directly associated with the impacted resource will also be included in this evaluation and/or mitigation.

Antiquities, historic, prehistoric ruins, paleontological or objects of scientific interest, identified or unidentified, that are outside of the authorization and not associated with the resource within the authorization will also be protected. Impacts that occur to such resources, which are related to the authorizations activities, will be mitigated at the holder's cost.

Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g), the holder of this authorization must notify the Authorized Officer, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4 (c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the Authorized Officer.

Invasive/Non-native species:

-The construction equipment must be cleaned prior to entering the project area.

Soils:

-The surface soils and vegetation must be scraped off from the excavation area and stockpiled, so that only clay soils are used in the embankment. The soils must then be spread evenly in an upland location.

-The proposed structures must have a core trench and be constructed in a series of soil lifts, each one having good compaction.

Vegetation:

-If native vegetation does not reclaim the ponds, then seeding the pond will be needed.

NAME OF PREPARER: Charles Cesar & Megan McGuire

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 8/16/07

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: /s/ David Stout

DATE SIGNED: 8/23/07

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: North Park Greater Sage-Grouse Ponds

Project Leader: Chuck Cesar, Megan McGuire

Date Submitted for Comment: June 22, 2007

Due Date for Comments: July 6, 2007

Need for a field Exam: None

Scoping Needs/Interested or Affected Publics:

Consultation/Permit Requirements:

Consultation	Date Initiated	Date Completed	Responsible Specialist/ Contractor	Comments
Cultural/Archeological Clearance/SHPO		7/16/07	B.Wyatt	
Native American		7/16/07	B. Wyatt	
T&E Species/FWS		7/2/07	C. Cesar	The BLM would comply with the reasonable and prudent alternatives once the USFWS determines them.
Permits Needed (i.e. Air or Water)		7/12/07	P. Belcher	Stock Water Tank applications can be filed by the BLM. Approval of the permits are necessary prior to construction.

(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					
NP	Air Quality	Belcher Allai	7/12/07	TA, PB	There would be no air quality impacts from the Proposed Action or the No Action Alternative.
NP	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	Stout	8/15/07	JS	There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern in the proximity of the proposed project area.
NI	Cultural Resources	Wyatt	7/16/07	BBW	A cultural resource survey (Report #CR-07-46) was completed for the proposed project. No sites were located, thus there would be no impacts to historic properties.
NP	Environmental Justice	Stout	8/15/07	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	Allai Belcher	7/12/07	TA, PB	There are no farmlands, prime or unique, in the proximity of the proposed project area.

NP	Floodplains	Belcher Allai	7/12/07	TA, PB	The proposed projects are outside of the floodplain and would not present an increase to the flood hazard.
PI	Invasive, Non-native Species	Torma	7/12/07	PT	See analysis in EA.
PI	Migratory Birds	Cesar	7/2/07	CC	See analysis in EA.
NI	Native American Religious Concerns	Wyatt	7/16/07	BBW	Of the five federally-recognized Native American tribes contacted no tribe to date has stated that they have concerns regarding the North Park Greater Sage-grouse Ponds Proposed Action. Thus, there would be no impacts.
PI	T/E, and Sensitive Species (Finding on Standard 4)	Cesar	7/2/07	CC	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wastes, Hazardous and Solid	Hodgson	7/17/07	KH	There are no quantities of wastes, hazardous or solid, located on BLM-administered lands in the proposed project area, and there would be no wastes generated as a result of the Proposed Action or No Action alternative.
PI	Water Quality, Surface and Ground (Finding on Standard 5)	Belcher Allai	7/12/07	TA, PB	See analysis in EA.
PI	Wetlands & Riparian Zones (Finding on Standard 2)	Belcher Allai	7/12/07	TA, PB	See analysis in EA.
NP	Wild and Scenic Rivers	Sterin	7/16/07	BS	There are no Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers in the project area. Thus, there would be no impacts.
NP	Wilderness	Sterin	7/16/07	BS	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 Allai	7/12/07	TA, PB	See analysis in EA.
PI	Vegetation (Finding on Standard 3)	Torma	7/12/07	PT	See analysis in EA.
PI	Wildlife, Aquatic (Finding on Standard 3)	Cesar	7/2/07	CC	See analysis in EA.
PI	Wildlife, Terrestrial (Finding on Standard 3)	Cesar	7/02/07	CC	See analysis in EA.
OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS					
	Access/Transportation	Monkouski	8/16/07	JM	Both ponds are off existing routes and work would not block through travel. Therefore, there would be no impacts.
NI	Forest Management	Rosene	8/2/07	NI	There would be no impacts.
NI	Geology and Minerals	Hodgson	7/17/07	KH	The proposed action or no action alternative would have no impacts to the geological or mineral resources within the project area.
PI	Hydrology/Water Rights	Belcher	7/25/07	PB	See analysis in EA.
NP	Paleontology	Rupp	8/16/07	FGR	There are no known or recorded Paleontological sites within the Area of Potential Affect. The proposed project areas are mapped as Coalmont formation, which has been classified as Class II (Paleontological

				Resource of NW Colorado: A Regional Analysis. Harley Armstrong and David Wolney, 1989). Class II formations are defined as: "Fossils of scientific significance are occasionally found in the formation within the Craig District." Standard cultural/paleontological discovery stipulations are recommended.
NI	Noise Monkouski	8/16/07	JM	The construction of the ponds will have a limited temporal noise disturbance with no significant impacts.
PI	Range Management Torma	7/12/07	PT	See analysis in EA.
NI	Lands/ Realty Authorizations Cassel	7/5/07	SC	There are no leases or permits in the proposed project location. There are two ROW, COC-12349 and COC-22720, granted to WAPA. There would be no impacts from the Proposed Action to these ROW's.
	Recreation Monkouski	8/16/07	JM	There would be no impacts to recreational activities that may occur in the proposed action area.
NI	Socio-Economics Stout	8/15/07	JS	There would be no socio-economic impacts.
NI	Visual Resources Koppa	7/3/07	JK	The proposed project area is located in an area classified as VRM Class III. The objective of VRM Class III is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The introduction of two ponds and one rebuilt pond would have minimal visual impact on the surrounding landscape.
PI	Cumulative Impact Summary Stout	8/15/07	JS	See analysis in EA.
FINAL REVIEW				
	P&E Coordinator Stout	8/16/07	JS	
	Field Manager McFadden			