United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Environmental Assessment UT- (insert NEPA log number) Month, Date, Year

Project Title

(Use a full, descriptive title for EA that reflects type/location of project)

Location: Applicant/Address:

Follow the italicized instructions and then delete the instructions.

Long Form EA Template

The long-form EA Template should be used when the ID Team Analysis Record Checklist identifies several issues that require detailed analysis; analysis of reasonable Alternatives to the proposed and no action alternatives is required; mitigation measures not included in the proposed action must be or there is a high level of public interest and there is a high probability of legal challenge.

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Field Office
Address
City, Utah ZIP Code
Phone:
FAX:



Project Title
UT- (insert NEPA log number)

Contents (Optional for relatively simple EAs)

	Page
4.6 PVPPOGE ANTEND	
1.0 PURPOSE and NEED	
1.1 Introduction	
1.2 Background	
1.3 Need for the Proposed Action	
1.4 Purpose of the Proposed Action	
1.5 Conformance with BLM Land Use Plan(s)	• •
1.6 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or other Plans	
1.7 Identification of Issues	
1.8 Summary	
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING	
PROPOSED ACTION	
2.1 Introduction.	
2.2 Alternative A- Proposed Action	
2.3 Alternative B – No Action	
2.4 Alternative C-X Other Action Alternatives	
2.Y Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated from Further Analysis	
2.7 Alternatives Considered, but Emimated from Further Analysis 2.Z Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts	
2.2 Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts	••
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	
3.1 Introduction.	
3.2 General Setting.	
3.3 Critical Elements of the Human Environment and Other Resources	• •
/Issues Brought Forward for Analysis	
3.3.1 Resource/Issue 1	
3.3.2 Resource/Issue 2.	
5.5.2 Resource/Issue 2	· • • •
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	
4.1 Introduction.	
4.2 Direct & Indirect Impacts	
4.2.1 Alternative A - Proposed Action	
4.2.1.1 Resource 1	
4.2.1.2 Resource 2	
4.2.1.3 Resource 3	
4.2.1.X Mitigation Measures	

4.2.1 V. Docidual Impacts	
4.2.1.7 Residual Impacts	
4.2.1.Z Monitoring and / or Compliance	
(subsections for all alternatives same as for 4.2.1 immediately above)	
4.2.3 Alternative $C - X$ - Other Action Alternatives (Agency Preferred	
if Applicable)	
4.3 Cumulative Impacts Analysis	
4.3.1 Past and Present Actions	
4.3.2 Reasonably Foreseeable Action Scenario (RFAS)	
4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts	
•	
5.0 CONSULTATION & COORDINATION	
5.1 Introduction	
5.2 Persons, Groups, & Agencies Consulted	
5.3 Summary of Public Participation	
5.3.1 Comment Analysis	
5.3.2 List of Commenters	
5.3.3 Response to Public Comment	,
5.4 List of Preparers	
5.0 REFERENCES, GLOSSARY	
6.1 References Cited	
6.2 Glossary of Terms	
6.3 List of Acronyms Used in this EA	•
ADDENDICES	
APPENDICES Appendix A – Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist	

Page

Follow the italicized instructions in this text box and then delete this text box.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE OF THIS TEMPLATE: Instructions and examples to assist in the preparation of the EA are provided in text boxes in this template. To prepare the EA, insert text outside of the instructional textboxes while following the instructions provided and using example language as appropriate. To move example language outside of the text boxes use the select, edit, cut and paste functions. After preparation of the EA sections, delete these text boxes. To delete the text boxes, place the curser in the text box, click the left mouse button, move the curser to near the upper center line circle of the box; when the crossing arrows appear click the left mouse button to highlight the box and delete the box by pressing delete or clicking on edit, then cut).

This template is intended to be somewhat flexible. Individual sections of the EA template may be modified in accordance with program specific guidance.

Project Title UT – (insert NEPA log number)

1.0 PURPOSE & NEED

1.1 Introduction:

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to disclose and analyze the environmental consequences of the (project) as proposed by (proponent's name). The EA is a site-specific analysis of potential impacts that could result with the implementation of a proposed action or alternatives to the proposed action. The EA assists the BLM in project planning and ensuring compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and in making a determination as to whether any "significant" impacts could result from the analyzed actions. "Significance" is defined by NEPA and is found in regulation 40 CFR 1508.27. An EA provides evidence for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a statement of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI). If the decision maker determines that this project has "significant" impacts following the analysis in the EA, then an EIS would be prepared for the project. If not, a Decision Record may be signed for the EA approving the selected alternative, whether the proposed action or another alternative. A Decision Record (DR), including a FONSI statement, documents the reasons why implementation of the selected alternative would not result in "significant" environmental impacts (effects) beyond those already addressed in ______ Resource Management Plan (mo., day, year).

Note: If the FONSI/DR is attached to the EA at the time that it is released, the wording given above must be modified to reflect the present tense, stating that a FONSI has been signed and an EIS is not required.

1.2 Background:

Briefly profile the proposed action by giving who wants to do what, where, and when. Provide enough information for the public and the decision maker to understand the proposal. This should be done very briefly and succinctly. Give location of proposal (legal, general description, and map, as appropriate). Identify any links the proposed action may have to other federal, state, or local projects, if any. Maps, photographs, etc. may be attached as plates.

EXAMPLE: The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to plug and abandon two artesian water wells located in T., R., section, Cainville Wash by stopping flow and filling the wells with cement. If approved, plugging operations would commence in October 2003. See attached location map.

1.3 Need for the Proposed Action

Summarize the **need for** the proposed action. Explain what needs to be accomplished, or what is driving the proposal. Focus on resource problems or, as appropriate, resource opportunities. If the need for the proposed action is to respond to BLM policy, state the policy and reference it. When appropriate, reference the applicable land use plan and its relevant objectives. All alternatives must meet this need. It is why the project is proposed.

Examples: 1) Company A has filed an Application for Permit to Drill (APD). The underlying need for the proposed action is for Company A to develop its Federal Lease UTU-____ by drilling an exploratory well, and if successful, to produce commercial quantities of oil and or gas from its Federal oil and gas lease. 2) BLM proposes to plug __abandoned wells in the ___ River watershed. The ___River has been identified as a major source of salinity in the Colorado River System. Saline water from the unplugged wells presently contributes to salinity in the ___and Colorado Rivers. One of the underlying needs for the proposed plugging of wells is to reduce the salinity of the ____and Colorado River. Also, saline ground water seeping from the wells that would be plugged could pollute water in the Wildcat #1 well that presently supports about acres of riparian vegetation. Another need for the proposed well plugging operation is to maintain water quality in the Wildcat #1 well and the riparian vegetation that depends on flow from the well. 3) The BLM in cooperation with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources proposes to mechanically treat up to acres of decadent and dead sagebrush in three phases and apply the knowledge and experience gained in each phase to the next. The underlying need for the proposed action is to maintain the health of about acres of sagebrush-steppe community. Over 600,000 acres of primarily Wyoming big sagebrush in Utah have been severely impacted by a six-year drought. The extent of the impact varies from sites with less than 50% sagebrush mortality, to sites with nearly eliminated. Approximately 55% of the impacted sagebrush habitat is on BLM-administered lands, and a major

100% mortality. Understory vegetation in many of these impacted sites has also been severely reduced or portion of the affected rangelands are considered important seasonal habitats for Gunnison's and greater sagegrouse and other sagebrush obligate species, as well as crucial winter ranges for mule deer and other big game.

Sagebrush mortality in the plots proposed for treatment in ____Valley and the_____ Point area ranges from 60 to 70 percent. Loss of sagebrush in this area could result in conversion from a sagebrush-steppe vegetation community to a grass dominated community.

1.4 Purpose(s) of the Proposed Action

List the BLM objectives or reasons for considering a non-bureau proposal. Describe BLM's authorities and purposes for reviewing the proposed action. List the government's other objectives (other than the underlying need) for considering the proposal. These will provide the basis for development of alternatives to the proposed action and the criteria and rationale for the decision that will follow the EA process. Give the source of each objective (law, regulation, agreement, agency mission, prior NEPA document, land use plan etc.). As appropriate, tell what indicator(s) (component(s) of the environment) would be used to assess each objective, such as water quality standards, winter forage for mule deer, ACEC objectives, to be accommodated,. Avoid listing as objectives the project actions being proposed. A sound objective should allow different options or alternatives to achieve the objective.

alternatives to achieve the objective.
Examples:
1) BLM is considering approval of private exploration and production from federal oil and gas leases because the activity is an integral part of BLM's oil and gas leasing program under authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. Additionally, oil and gas exploration and development is recognized as an appropriate use of public lands in theResource Manage Plan that provides management direction for the leased area. BLM will consider approval of the proposed drilling in a manner that avoids or reduces impact on wintering mule deer and other resources and activities as identified in theRMP, best meets the objectives of theACEC, and is consistent with the lease rights granted to the applicant and prevents unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands.
2) BLM is proposing to plug thewells in order to meet the RMP's goals of eliminating or reducing pollutants into surface water and to achieve water quality that provides protection and propagation of fish, amphibians, wildlife, livestock, and recreation in an on the waters of the public lands and to restore and maintain the chemical, physical and biological integrity of the area's waters as required by the State of Utah's and EPA's water quality standards promulgated under authority of the Clean Water Act of 1972 as amended. BLM will consider plugging the wells in a way that minimizes direct impacts on biological and scenic resources in the project area, minimizes secondary impacts on availability of water to livestock, and best meets the objectives of theCounty Master Plan.
3) BLM is proposing the restoration of acres of sagebrush steppe community because FLPMA requires BLM to manage the multiple-uses of the public lands, including range, wildlife and natural values, without permanent impairment. Additionally, the project is intended to meet the goals of theRMP which directs management of the area proposed for treatment to ensure that management of native plant species enhances, restores and does not reduce the biological and genetic diversity of natural ecosystems.
Other objectives of the proposed treatment action are to: 1) ensure that drought-impacted sagebrush communities are not replaced by invasive annual species such as cheatgrass, which could lead to unnatural increases in wildfire frequency; 2) provide winter forage and habitat for mule deer and other wildlife in critical deer winter range in the Utah Division Wildlife Resources (UDWR) Herd Unit; 3) reduce soil loss, 4) conduct the treatment in a way that minimizes impacts to other resources; 5) apply and test various sagebrush habitat restoration methods in a scientific manner with the goal of improving knowledge, effectiveness, and cost-efficiency of sagebrush habitat efforts in the future; and 6) conduct the treatment in a way that conforms with the BLM RMP (1991) and as consistently as possible with the

1.5 Conformance with BLM Land Use Plan(s):

Specify results of the Land Use Plan conformance review. Does the plan specifically identify a resource management action? If not, is the action consistent with the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan? The following information must be provided:

- Land Use Plan Name and its approval date;
- Conformance review results, identifying and stating the specific decision(s); or
- If the plan does not specifically identify the action, explain how the action would be consistent with plan objectives, terms and/or conditions;
- If appropriate, state that a new land use plan decision would be necessary to accommodate the action.

Examples: The proposed action and alternatives described below are in conformance with the Resource Management Plan, approved
 They conform to decision(s), on page(s), which state(s): "It has been determined that the proposed action and alternative(s) would not conflict with other decisions throughout the plan. Although the proposed action and alternative(s) are not specifically mentioned in the plan, they are consistent with its objectives, goals, and decisions as they relate to XXX programs and/or YYY resources as stated on pages and of the RMP.

1.6 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or other Plans:

The following information must be provided:

- State whether or not the action is consistent with federal laws and regulations, provide appropriate citations;
- Specify consistency with Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines and Native American Trust Resource policies;
- List all known federal, state, and local approvals and permits required, identified by type and entity; state whether the proposed action and alternatives are consistent with other plans, programs, and policies of affiliated Tribes, other federal agencies, state, and local governments to the extent practical within federal law, regulation, and policy;
- List any other EIS/EAs that influence the scope of this document [e.g., tiering].

1.7 Identification of Issues:

Summarize the scoping process and activities that have been completed for the proposed action, such as public notification, including ENBB posting date, news releases, meetings, and other public involvement efforts. Cross reference to Chapter 5, Consultation and Coordination. Explain the relevant issues that are identified through the scoping process. Provide a brief definition that issues are essentially an effect on a particular resource component.

Refer to Appendix A of the EA, which contains a checklist of all resources considered. Particularly important is the consideration of the Critical Elements of the Human Environment. These elements are subject to the requirements specified in statute, regulation, or executive order, and must be considered in all EAs (BLM H-1790-1, Appendix 5). Provide as part of the checklist in Appendix A, a clear rationale for dismissing each resource from further analysis in the EA.

Identify the relevant issues that cannot be dismissed and must be carried through analysis in the EA. First identify the resource (i.e., wildlife, recreation, etc.). Then, in bullet form, specify the issue related to the resource. For example, impacts on mule deer critical winter range would be an issue under "Wildlife;" impacts on the use of an OHV loop trail would be an issue under "Recreation;" and impacts on prehistoric sites eligible for the National Register would be an issue under "Cultural Resources." The relevant issues should be presented in the following format:

1.7.1 Resource

- Issue 1
- *Issue* 2

1.7.2 Resource

- Issue 1
- *Issue* 2

Examples:

- 1.7.1 Water Quality
 - Increase in total suspended particulates in a 3 mile segment of Chokecherry Creek below the proposed stream crossing.
 - Increases in coliform bacteria in two culinary water wells near the proposed septic system.

1.7.2 Wildlife

- Temporary loss of winter forage for mule deer in Herd Unit 10A due to the proposed fire.
- Declines in deer populations in Herd Unit 10A due to harassment of deer by OHV users.

1.8 Summary:

This chapter has presented the purpose and need of the proposed project, as well as the relevant issues, i.e., those elements of the human environment that could be affected by the implementation of the proposed project. In order to meet the purpose and need of the proposed project in a way that resolves the issues, the BLM has developed a range of action alternatives. These alternatives, as well as a no action alternative, are presented in Chapter 2. The potential environmental impacts or consequences resulting from the implementation of each alternative are then analyzed in Chapter 4 for each of the identified issues.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING PROPOSED ACTION

The interdisciplinary team rigorously explores and objectively evaluates all reasonable alternatives that meet the underlying need for the proposed action. This fulfills the requirement of taking a "hard look." Other key components of this chapter include:

- Formulate alternatives that relate to the purpose and need (objective and indicators), other applicable sideboards outlined in 2.1 below
- Compare and contrast the alternatives by how they respond to the issues, purpose and need, and other applicable sideboards. This sets the stage for presenting and assessing in greater detail their consequences in Chapter 4.
- Insure clear basis for choice among/between the alternative; each alternative must be equally detailed. If the proposal is complicated or includes many stages of implementation, decommissioning, etc., it may be necessary to include a matrix summarizing the specific elements of the proposed action and alternatives.

2.1 Introduction:

Briefly and succinctly describe the criteria used for developing the range of alternatives and the objectives of each alternative. Present the assumptions or "givens," policies, regulations and/or practices, management direction, and standard operating procedures that will form the framework for the alternatives. Succinctly restate the objective(s) of the proposal and explain how the issues and indicators vary between/among the alternatives.

2.2 Alternative A – Proposed Action:

Identify the applicant, if not BLM. Include quantifiable information (e.g., location, extent, timing, duration, acres, workforce, etc.). Include all design features as they relate to the issues, objectives, and indicators. Outline applicant committed environmental protection measures. Caution: Do not change the proposed action without first consulting with and obtaining written agreement from the applicant, if not BLM. In cases where a proponent's proposal lacks adequate detail, prepare and submit a deficiency report that requires the applicant to provide information necessary for the BLM to meaningfully evaluate the proposed action.

2.3 Alternative B – No Action:

Describe the present management activities, change agents, or the continuation of the current situation that will occur even if the proposed action is denied. If the reasonably foreseeable action scenario for cumulative impacts includes related or cumulative actions that are not within the control of BLM, cross reference to that section of the EA and explain that these actions would likely proceed even if the proposed action is denied

Discuss constraints on selection of the alternative. Explain what the applicant would likely do if the proposal were not granted? Explain that the analysis of this alternative provides important baseline information for the

2.4 Alternatives C – X: Other Action Alternatives:

These alternatives, if appropriate, may build on the Proposed Action to include mitigation measures necessary to resolve resource conflicts/issues and to meet agency objectives in different ways (Add as many additional action alternatives as needed that resolve resource conflicts, respond to public controversy or as directed by management in order to reasonably explore and take a "hard look" at options. State clearly the objective(s) of the alternative.

<u>If no other alternatives are analyzed in detail, delete this heading</u> and, in the section entitled "Alternatives considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis" explain why no other alternatives are analyzed.

Note: Any of the alternatives may be labeled as the AGENCY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE depending on the preferences of the authorized officer. Rationale for identification of the preferred alternative should not be presented in the text of the EA, but must be identified in the rationale for the selected alternative in the Decision Record.

2.Y Alternatives Considered, but Eliminated from Further Analysis:

Generally, alternatives need not be analyzed if they do not meet the underlying need for the proposal, resolve conflicts, mitigate impacts, or create impacts greater than the proposed action. Economic considerations should not be the sole reason for eliminating an alternative. Alternatives not legally available to the agency should be analyzed if they would reduce impacts on the environment. List and briefly describe any alternatives considered but not analyzed. Provide a rationale for dropping such alternatives from further consideration. Include alternatives that were considered during the early feasibility discussions to show that BLM has considered a full range of alternatives. For example, if several sites for an APD were considered during an on-site visit before a proposed location was identified, discuss the process and tell why the early sites were dismissed. If a proponent claims an alternative is not feasible, the BLM should provide an independent evaluation of feasibility.

2.Z Summary Comparison of Environmental Impacts:

OPTIONAL - This is not required in an EA. However, a brief, succinct summary at this place in the document may assist the reader and the decision maker if there are more than 2 alternatives, or if complex issues are to be analyzed. Impacts may be compared in a matrix of alternatives and issues or in narrative form.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Appropriate scoping analysis will identify which environmental elements would be affected. The following are guidelines to assist in development and presentation of this chapter:

- Limit the discussion of environmental elements to only that which is necessary to understand the effects of the alternatives. Do not include encyclopedic information, but summarize what is needed for assessment/analysis.
- Describe the affected environment with the same indicators and units of measure used in Chapter 4.
- Summarize and incorporate by reference wherever possible. Remember that referenced material must be available to a reviewer and the reviewer told where the information can be obtained.
- Site-specific resource "clearance reports," surveys, inventories need to be properly referenced to substantiate discussions or conclusions.
- Present environmental components/resources in a consistent order throughout the document, e.g., alphabetical order, magnitude of conflict, etc.
- The identification of issues and analysis of environmental consequences should be completed before beginning preparation of the EA. Chapters 3 and 4 may be written separately, but must be jointly finalized. Some teams prefer to complete Chapter 4 before Chapter 3. The objectives here are to: a) focus only on those environmental components that would be actually affected by the alternatives (i.e. the issues identified in Chapter 1), and b) remove possible confusion of having new baseline information introduced in Chapter 4, or impacts analyzed in Chapter 3.

3.1 Introduction:

This chapter presents the potentially affected existing environment (i.e., the physical, biological, social, and economic values and resources) of the impact area as identified in the Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist found in Appendix A and presented in Chapter 1 of this assessment. This chapter provides the baseline for comparison of impacts/consequences described in Chapter 4.

3.2 General Setting:

Briefly describe the environmental setting of the project area, include physiographic province, general climate, major vegetation types [if not discussed elsewhere in this Chapter], elevation, historical uses, precipitation, and any other general information that helps the reader understand the area. A site specific map and photographs should be considered.

3.3 Critical Elements of the Human Environment and Other Resources Brought Forward for Analysis:

Discuss only those resources and issues that are identified in section 1.7; those determined to be **potentially impacted** in the Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist. Refer to Appendix A for additional information. The existing environment, conditions, and trends related to each resource for which there is an issue are described in detail. This narrative provides the indicators, and units of measure that will be subsequently analyzed for degree of change in Chapter 4.

The description of the affected environment should portray what is, not what would be, and should avoid any impact language. Make sure the affected environment tracks in logic, order of presentation, level of detail indicators and units of measure with the environmental impacts section.

3.3.1 Resource 1:

For consistency, the potentially impacted resources must be addressed in the same order presented in Chapters 1 and 4.

3.3.2 Resource 2:

Continue until all resources are presented.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Analysis of the environmental consequences (impacts) is separate and distinct from preparation of the EA. Impact analysis is a thinking, investigative, and analytical process completed by an interdisciplinary team. Preparation of the EA is a writing, editorial, and publication process which is necessary to document the investigation and impact analysis made by the team. Remember, do not use the word "significant" in the analysis or EA. Provide the context, magnitude and intensity of the impact so that the decision maker can determine significance when the FONSI and DR are prepared.

4.1 Introduction:

Set the stage for the analysis. Briefly and succinctly summarize what issues and resources are to be analyzed; provide any analysis assumptions and/or management guidelines that will help define the limits of analysis. If all mitigation has been included in the Descriptions of the Alternatives, state that: "Because all known mitigating measures have been included in the Descriptions of the Alternatives, the environmental consequences described below are unavoidable." When this is the case, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts sections should not be included in this chapter.

4.2 Direct/Indirect Impacts:

Follow the outline provided below for all alternatives analyzed in detail.

Identify and analyze direct and indirect impacts on the affected environment caused by the change agents (actions) described for the proposed action, including any policies or standard program requirements. The order of presentation, level of detail, indicators and units of measure should be the same as in Chapter 3. Analysis can be divided into the following component parts:

- Cause of the impact: What would cause an impact, i.e., change, in the present or future environment?
- Nature of the impact: What would be affected / impacted and how would it be affected?
- Context and intensity: Where would the impact occur? What is the geographic location and extent of change? What is the magnitude or degree of change? How can the magnitude be expressed qualitatively (empirically measurable units) or quantitatively (relative comparative terms)?

4.2.1 Alternative A – Proposed Action:

4.2.1.1 Resource 1:

Example: Wildlife

Issue: Impacts on Mule Deer Populations in Herd Unit 10A.

1) Clearing of two acres of land for installation of the water tank would decrease forage production used by deer in the winter months by 400 pounds per year for the 30-year life of the water tank. The decrease in forage production would eliminate feed for one deer for one month. The 5000 undisturbed acres in Herd Unit 10A would continue to produce about 1 million pounds of forage each year. This is sufficient to feed approximately 2500 deer. Since there are only an estimated 600 deer in the herd unit, there would be sufficient forage available to feed the herd through the winter.

4.2.1.2 Resource 2:

Example: Livestock Grazing

Issue: Impact of forage loss on levels of Livestock Grazing

The stripping of 200 acres of vegetation for the proposed mine would decrease available forage for livestock in the Verdant Allotment by 10 AUMs. The decrease of 10 AUMs in the 400 AUM allotments would reduce the allowable number of AUMs by 2.5%. This reduction in AUMs would reduce the number of allowable cattle by 2, or a decrease of 1%. The economic impact of reduction of the number of permitted cattle is analyzed in the socio-economic impacts section of this EA.

4.2.1.3 Resource 3:

Continue in this outline format to present all relevant resources and issues.

4.2.1.*X* Mitigation Measures:

Note: this section is not required if all mitigation has been identified in the Descriptions of the Alternatives. Describe any measures not included in the description of the proposed action which could mitigate some or all of the impacts identified in the analysis of environmental impacts. If all the measures are incorporated into the proposed action, state that no measures other than those incorporated into the proposed action have been identified. State whether the mitigation measure(s) would completely or partially negate the environmental impact. Analyze the effectiveness of the mitigating measure. If additional mitigation is identified for several resources, add a new alternative to the EA and analysis that incorporates all of the proposed mitigation.

4.2.1. *Y* Residual Impacts:

Note: this section is not required if all mitigation has been identified in the Descriptions of the Alternatives. Describe the impacts on the affected environment which would remain after application of the mitigation measures, if any. Be sure to analyze the impacts of the proposed mitigation measures on other resources. For example, chaining and seeding proposed to mitigate impacts on wildlife may result in impacts on water quality, recreation, visual, or other resources that must be analyzed in the EA.

4.2.1. Z. Monitoring and/or Compliance:

Monitoring and/or compliance must be identified for all NEPA actions. The main purposes of NEPA related monitoring are to: evaluate the quality of the NEPA document, ensure compliance with the NEPA decision, measure the effectiveness or success of application stipulations, and evaluate the validity of NEPA decisions. Provide the following information as part of the analysis process:

- Identify what resource(s) should be monitored and why. The issues identified by the ID team should be used to focus the monitoring on those resources of primary concern.
- Identify who would conduct the monitoring, including skills and equipment necessary and methods to be used.
- Describe the frequency and duration of the monitoring activity.
- The suggested monitoring is identified in the EA. The commitment to this monitoring is made in the Decision Record.

Note: If monitoring is deemed unnecessary for an action, the following statement should be incorporated into the EA: "No monitoring needs have been identified for this action."

If monitoring needs have been described as a part of the proposed action, incorporate the following sentence: "The monitoring described in the proposed action would be sufficient for this action because . . . (insert rationale)."

4.2.2. Alternative B – No Action:

Explain that if the proposal is rejected, there would be no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts from the proposed action. However, do describe the impacts of the actions that would continue even if the proposed action is not approved, including any impacts resulting from reasonably foreseeable projects identified below.

4.2.3 Alternative C - X - Other Action Alternatives (Agency Preferred if applicable):

4.3 Cumulative Impacts Analysis:

"Cumulative impacts" are those impacts resulting from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.

4.3.1 Past and Present Actions:

Past or ongoing actions that affect the same components of the environment as the proposed action are:

Describe and explain the actions and activities that are in place or ongoing that affect the same environmental components that the proposed and alternative actions would affect.

4.3.2 Reasonably Foreseeable Action Scenario (RFAS)

The following RFAS identifies reasonably foreseeable future actions that would cumulatively affect the same resources in the cumulative impact area as the proposed action and alternatives.

Include a reasonably foreseeable action scenario (RFAS) that identifies the actions and impact area(s). In order to be reasonably foreseeable, actions must be planned or proposed. They need not be speculative or in the distant future.

4.3.3 Cumulative Impacts:

Incorporate cumulative analysis from existing documents by reference and tier to the existing land use plan, as appropriate. If no cumulative effects are anticipated from the action, use the following: "It has been determined that cumulative impacts would be negligible as a result of the proposed action or alternatives because...."

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION:

5.1 Introduction:

The issue identification section of Chapter 1 identifies those issues analyzed in detail in Chapter 4. Appendix A provides the rationale for issues that were considered but not analyzed further. The issues were identified through the public and agency involvement process described in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below.

5.2 Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted:

List all persons, agencies, and organizations consulted, and the purpose of such consultations. A table may be used for this purpose. Note: This applies only to those consulted whose information assisted in the preparation of the EA, not those that commented on the EA during a public comment period. Sample wording is provided. The actual wording must be developed based on the circumstances of the proposal and results of the consultation process.

Table 5-1: List of all Persons, Agencies and Organizations
Consulted for Purposes of this EA

Consulted for Furposes of this EA			
	Purpose & Authorities for		
Name	Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions	
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (US	Information on Consultation, under	The Service agrees, by letter dated, that	
FWS)	Section 7 of the Endangered	the proposed action may affect but would not	
	Species Act (16 USC 1531)	adversely affect listed species because	
		(Refer to Appendix)	
Utah State Historic Preservation	Consultation for undertakings, as	SHPO has approved, by letter dated,	
Office (SHPO)	required by the National Historic	that	
	Preservation Act (NHPA) (16 USC	(Refer to Appendix)	
	470)		
Tribe	Consultation as required by the	A meeting was held on (date) to	
	American Indian Religious	describe and discuss the concerns of the Tribe	
	Freedom Act of 1978 (42 USC	concerning the proposed action. A follow-up	
	1531) and NHPA (16 USC 1531)	letter was sent and/or phone calls made on	
		$\underline{\hspace{1cm}}$ ($date(s)$). The Tribe has responded by	
		letter dated, that OR The Tribe has	
		not responded identifying any concerns. Lack	
		of response is interpreted by BLM to indicate	
		that the Tribe has no concerns relative to the	
		proposed action.	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The project would require a permit	The Corps has indicated that the project meets	
	from the Corps under authority of	the nationwide permit criteria which states	
	Section 404 of the Clean Water		
	Act (33 USC 1251)		
Utah Div. of Wildlife Resources	Consult with UDWR as the agency	Data and analysis regarding big game species	
	with expertise on impacts on game species.	incorporated into Chapters 3 and 4.	

Table 5-1: List of all Persons, Agencies and Organizations Consulted for Purposes of this EA

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
	0013811111101101	2 manage et contraterone

5.3 Summary of Public Participation:

Describe in greater detail than Chapter 1, the process used to involve meaningful participation by the public. Discuss the need for public comment, or if comment period is not afforded, include date of posting on ENBB, when and how scoping was conducted, dates of public meetings [if any], dates of public comment period, etc. See Chapter 2 for guidance on public involvement.)

Example: During preparation of the EA, the public was notified of the proposed action by posting on the Utah Internet Homepage on ___date. The process used to involve the public included_____. A public comment period was (not) offered (because....) between ___month/date/year and ___month/date/year.

5.3.1 Comment Analysis:

If applicable, complete this section after the public comment period. Delete this section in EAs that are being released for public comment. Follow the guidance provided in the public involvement section of this Guidebook.

5.3.2 List of Commenters:

If applicable, complete this section after the public comment period. Delete this section in EAs that are being released for public comment. List all individuals/entities providing comment on the EA. If appropriate, provide a succinct summary of the comments received or copies of the letters with the comments bracketed and numbered for response. Include copies of letters from state, local, and tribal governments (and agencies) and members of Congress.

5.3.3 Response to Public Comment:

If applicable, group similar/like comments under appropriate headings if numerous comments are received. See Chapter 9 of the Guidebook for guidance and examples on responding to comments.

5.4 List of Preparers:

List all preparers, their area(s) of expertise, and the section(s) of the document they prepared. If the EA is prepared for BLM by a consultant, BLM should **not** be listed as an agency consulted, but rather included in the list of preparers. This information may be presented in table format. Sample wording is provided. The actual wording must be developed based on the actual preparers of the EA.

Table 5.4: List of Preparers:

5.4.1 BLM:

DENI:			
		Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this	
Name	Title	Document	
Robert Raptor	Team Leader	Technical Coordination & Quality Control	
Jim Rafter	Recreation Specialist	Impact analysis for recreation, and visual	
		resource management	
Stephen McCoy	Petroleum Engineer	Impact analysis for energy mineral resources	

5.4.2 Non-BLM Preparers: (Name the Non-BLM Preparer (company name(s), contractor, etc.)

TYON BELLY TECHNICIDE (Name the tyon BELLY Treparer (company name(s), contractor, etc.)			
		Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this	
Name	Title	Document	
John Smith	Team Leader	Technical Coordination & Quality Control	
Mike Falcon	Wildlife Biologist	Impact analysis for big game, T&E animal	
		species	
Donna Bales	Soils/Watershed	Impact analysis for watershed, water quality,	
	Specialist	and reclamation	

_ /	 $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.Μ	•

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document

5.4.2 Non-BLM Preparers

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document

6.0 REFERENCES, GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

6.1 References Cited:

This chapter provides literature references for all citations within the body of the EA. "Best professional judgment" conclusions should reference published articles, documents, in-house working documents, etc. as the basis for the judgment. Specialists must turn in a list of complete references along with their other EA input. Cite published scientific information where possible. Include at a minimum BLM documents used such as a cultural PMOA, Water Quality 303(d) list; BLM/NRCS range site guides; published soil surveys, T&E IM 96-69, and IM-97-66 (which includes official UT BLM sensitive species list, etc.) Other credible references include published articles or studies in scientific journals; other agency and university studies; Utah statistics; published state/county socio-economic statistics; and published information provided on the internet. There are various styles for the citations and references. The Franklin Quest Style Guide for Business and Technical Communication, Third Edition, 1997, provides rules for citations on page 49, and bibliography on pages 29 and 30. Be consistent in the style of citations and references. Writers should use the reference worksheet provided in Appendix 5 of this Guidebook to record references cited in the analysis and EA, and submit to EA preparer for inclusion in the EA.

Common Examples:

- 1) Finch, Deborah M. & Scott H. Stoleson, eds., 2000. *Status, Ecology & Conservation of the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher*. General Tech Report RMRS-GTR-60. Ogden, UT: USDA, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. 131 pp.
- 2) MacMurphy, John. "Effects of streamside vegetation on water temperature." Personal telephone call. May, 24, 2002.

6.2 Glossary of Terms:

Optional - If the EA includes technical terms that must defined in order for the readers to understand the document, provide a glossary of terms (including the source for the definition) used in the EA. List in alphabetical order all technical terms or phrases used in the EA. Provide a source for the definition provided; explain if there may be any deviations from the official/legal definition used and why.

6.3 List of Acronyms Used in this EA:

Optional - If several acronyms are used in the EA, or if there are confusing acronyms, provide a list of any acronyms and their full translation as a courtesy to the reader. The acronyms and their translations should be listed List in alphabetical order. Provide a definition for the acronym in the glossary, if appropriate.

APPENDICES:

The appendices should include information that is necessary for understanding or supporting the analysis and text of the EA.

This section may include any of the following, as necessary:

- Detailed descriptions of project components necessary to support technical analysis
- Topographic maps or engineering drawings, referred to in text as figures or plates
- Photographs
- Any visual enhancements to help the reader
- Charts, graphs, figures, tables, etc.
- Technical reports
- Conclusion of consultation correspondence including determinations/concurrence

APPENDIX A

Appendix A of an Environmental Assessment will always be the "Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist," which is found in Chapter 5 of the Guidebook (a template of this checklist is also available).

APPENDIX A:

Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist