

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2004-125-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC-068075

PROJECT NAME: West Johnson Draw Gravel Pit

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T1N, R102W, NENE Sec. 9

APPLICANT: Rio Blanco County Road & Bridge

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Proposed Action: Rio Blanco County Road & Bridge proposes to extract up to 20,000 tons (approximately 15,000 cubic yards) annually or up 100,000 cubic yards total. The material will be used to surface and maintain county roads in the surrounding area. The proposed pit is located approximately 1.5 miles west of Rangely, Colorado, south off Rio Blanco County Road 2. Access is approximately 200 yards west of the county's current gravel pit. The ¼ mile of access road to the pit location will be upgraded.

Estimated depth of topsoil is 6 inches and with an overburden of 4 feet.

Total pit disturbance will be approximately 10 acres. Post mining land will have no side slopes greater than 3:1 and the floor of the mining area will be a slope of no less than 1% and compacted areas will be ripped during reclamation. Topsoil will be stockpiled, until reclamation then will be spread evenly over the re-contoured site to a depth of 6 inches or more and prepared into a suitable seedbed. Re-contouring furrowing ripping and seeding will be done progressively in conjunction with the removal of the material. The following seed mix is proposed:

SPECIES	VARIETY	LBS PLS/ACRE
Western wheatgrass	Arriba	3.2
Thickspike wheatgrass	Critana	2.2
Streambank wheatgrass	Siberian	2.2
Russian wildrye	Vinal	2.0
Crested wheatgrass	Ephraim	2.0
	Total pounds PLS/Acre	11.6

Seed will be drilled with a grass drill having double disk openers and packer wheels and set with a planting depth at approximately ½ inch. In areas that cannot be drilled, seed will be broadcast at double seeding rate and harrowed into the soil.

No Action Alternative: Rio Blanco County would not be issued the free use permit and a county gravel pit would not be developed at this location.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD:

NEED FOR THE ACTION: Act of July 31, 1947 as amended (30 USC 601 *et seq.*)

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: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: Page 2-8

Decision Language: “Facilitate the orderly and environmentally sound development of mineral material resources.”

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:

STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LAND HEALTH: In January 1997, Colorado Bureau of Land Management (BLM) approved the Standards for Public Land Health. These standards cover upland soils, riparian systems, plant and animal communities, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Standards describe conditions needed to sustain public land health and relate to all uses of the public lands. Because a standard exists for these five categories, a finding must be made for each of them in an environmental analysis. These findings are located in specific elements listed below:

CRITICAL ELEMENTS

AIR QUALITY

Affected Environment: There are no special designation air sheds or non-attainment areas nearby that would be affected by the proposed action. During periods of low precipitation, air quality in the area of the proposed action is often diminished by dust caused by human disturbance.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would result in short term, local impacts to air quality during the time of gravel removal, due to dust being

blown into the air. Depending on the length of time the gravel pit is in use, this impact could become a nuisance as more vegetation is removed and hillsides are left exposed to climatic elements. After adequate vegetation is reestablished, blowing dust should return to pre-gravel pit levels.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No increase in dust will occur.

Mitigation: Require water spreading on the road surface and spoil piles to control fugitive dust and to help minimize short-term impacts. If blowing dust becomes an unmanageable problem require the disturbed areas to be covered with a fabric to avoid dust being blown into the air.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed gravel pit area has been inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level (Conner, 2004, Compliance Dated 8/26/2004) with no cultural resources identified in the 30.5 acre inventory area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action will not impact any known cultural resources.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no new impacts to cultural resources under the No Action Alternative.

Mitigation: 1. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has

been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, 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

Affected Environment: The area for the proposed pit has been inventoried for the presence of noxious weeds. The two currently occurring in the area are cheatgrass and halogeaon. Cheatgrass is a surface dominating annual grass that prevents development of productive native communities. Halogeaon is a non-native forb which is highly toxic to livestock particularly sheep. Of concern are the knapweed species which are highly adapted to this area and are often transported by heavy equipment and support vehicles. The knapweed species readily invade native rangelands decreasing their utility for forage and decreasing soil stability.

The vegetation community is a salt desert association which is adapted to saline soils and low precipitation zones. The area around Rangely receives between 8-10 inches of precipitation per year. During drought years this is cut to 4-6 inches per year.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: During the life of the project the county would be responsible for control of noxious weeds. The county maintains a weed control program that has the capability to handle any problems that develop. Following reclamation if any noxious weeds were to occur the Rio Blanco County would control them. If halogeaon were to occur, a determination would have to be made if spraying would provide any benefit, or if reclamation needed to be promoted.

The proposed seed mix contains the non-native species crested wheatgrass and Russian wildrye. These two species are highly adapted to this area and have not been shown to interbreed with adjacent species or to move offsite.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts.

Mitigation: From the White River, ROD/RMP of 1997, Appendix B, #179. Application of herbicides must be under field supervision of an EPA-certified pesticide applicator. Herbicides must be registered by the EPA and application proposals must be approved by the BLM.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: The project area consists of an arid Wyoming big sagebrush bench (15-20% canopy cover) with small inclusions of shadscale, greasewood, and winterfat. Characteristically, these shrublands support a sparse, but appropriate understory of Indian ricegrass, western wheatgrass, galleta, and globemallow. Although variable, much of the project has a considerable cheatgrass component. These arid shrublands typically support about 1 bird or less per acre and the project site would be expected to support no more than a half dozen pair of Brewer's and vesper sparrow, green-tailed towhee, sage thrasher, and/or western meadowlark during the nesting season (mid-April through mid-July). Those bird populations associated with this Resource Area's salt desert and low-elevation sagebrush shrublands identified as having higher conservation interest by the Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, Partners in Flight program include Brewer's sparrow, green-tailed towhee, and sage sparrow. These birds are common and well distributed in extensive suitable habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Site preparation and vegetation clearing for this project is expected to commence soon after authorization (fall 2004) and prior to the arrival of breeding birds. Although the action represents an incremental loss of low-elevation sagebrush nesting habitat, once the site is cleared there would be no further potential to interfere materially with nest substrate or nesting efforts on-site. Activity associated with the gravel operation could be expected to occasionally disrupt nesting efforts on the site's periphery (about 2 acres), but since nest initiation would normally have been conducted in the face of ongoing pit operations, continued work would not be expected to consistently fail nests of birds more tolerant of human activity. The reclaimed gravel pit on the next ridge to the east would be expected to offset the capacity of this site within 10 years.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no action authorized that would have immediate potential to disrupt nest substrate or nest efforts of migratory birds.

Mitigation: None.

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

Affected Environment: There are no animals listed or candidate to the Endangered Species Act that are known to inhabit or derive important benefit from these arid shrubland benches. Although situated along the terraces of the lower White River, there is no habitat suitable for bald eagle roosting or nesting functions (i.e., riverine cottonwoods) within a mile of the project. Ongoing reclamation and site management prevents substantive offsite soil movement that could influence aquatic conditions for Colorado pike-minnow (e.g., excessive sedimentation). There are no evident problems with erosion on an adjacent county-operated pit to the east.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action would have no conceivable affect on animals listed, proposed, candidate, or petitioned for listing under the

Endangered Species Act. Similarly, there are no animals considered sensitive by BLM that would be potentially influenced by this action.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The proposed and no-action alternative would have no effective influence on special status species or associated habitat and would, therefore, have no potential to influence the status of applicable land health standards.

WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID

Affected Environment: Hazardous or solid wastes are not expected to be a part of the affected environment. However, these materials may accidentally be introduced in the environment through the implementation of the proposed action. Fuel, oil, grease, and antifreeze are all associated with vehicles and fire suppression equipment associated with implementing the proposed action and would only be introduced into the environment because of equipment failure. Minute loss of these materials through normal operation of equipment, maintenance and fueling procedures are not considered spills. Spills are generally defined as the loss of large quantities of these materials into the environment and are determined to be a spill on a case-by-case basis.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: For any given accident or incident involving hazardous materials, consequences will be dependent on the volume and nature of the incident and material released. Short term impacts such as contaminations of soils, vegetation, and surface water could occur.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No hazardous wastes would be introduced into the environment under the no action alternative.

Mitigation: None

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

Affected Environment: The proposed action is in Johnson and Wood Road Draws, which is identified in segment 22 all tributaries to the White River, including all wetlands, lakes and reservoirs, from a point immediately above the confluence with Douglas Creek to the Colorado/Utah border. A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water quality concerns have been identified. This gravel pit is in a Category 1, Priority 2, watershed (The Lower White) identified in the Unified Watershed Assessment report. The state has reasons to believe this watershed has water quality problems (sediment and salinity

loads) that may impair the watershed. The State has classified this stream segment as Aquatic Life Warm 1, Recreation 1a, Water Supply and Agriculture. The state has further defined water quality parameters with table values. These standards reflect the ambient water quality and define maximum allowable concentrations for the various water quality parameters. The anti-degradation rule applies to this segment meaning no further water quality degradation is allowable that would interfere with or become harmful to the designated uses.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Impacts to water quality from development of this gravel pit would be similar to other surface disturbing activities. Some of the impacts would be exposure of soil surface to wind and water erosion, reduced water quality due to erosion of sediment and salt, off disturbed areas, and piping or rill erosion where soils are exposed to climatic elements. These impacts would be short term until re-vegetation has occurred.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: If blowing soils become a problem the applicant may have to implement a BMP to keep the salt and sediment from being displaced.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: The ability of the drainages to meet the state water quality standards would remain unchanged as a result of the proposed action.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, riparian/wetland communities, Wilderness, or Wild and Scenic Rivers, threatened, endangered or sensitive plants exist within the area affected by the proposed action. For threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species and riparian communities, the Public Land Health Standard is not applicable since neither the proposed nor the no-action alternative would have any influence on riparian habitat or channel conditions or populations of, or habitats potentially occupied by, special status plants. There are also no Native American religious or environmental justice concerns associated with the proposed action.

NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS

The following elements **must** be addressed due to the involvement of Standards for Public Land Health:

SOILS (includes a finding on Standard 1)

Affected Environment: Baseline soils data have been collected for Rio Blanco County by the NRCS and are published in an order III Soil Survey. This survey is available for review from the White River Field Office. The table below identifies soil characteristics for soil types

affected by the proposed action. Several areas have been designated as CSU-1, which indicates problems such as fragile soil, high salt concentrations, excessive erosion, or steep slopes.

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Range site	Salinity	Runoff	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
21	Cliffdown-Cliffdown Variant complex	5-65%	Salt desert Breaks	<2	Medium to slow	Slight to moderate	>60
46	Kinnear fine sandy loam	1-5%	Loamy Salt desert	<4	Medium	Slight	>60
93	Turley fine sandy loam	0-3%	Alkaline Slopes	2-4	Medium	Slight	>60
95	Uffens loam	0-5%	Alkaline Slopes	4-8	Slow	Moderate	>60

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The CSU-1 stipulation description states, surface-disturbing activities will be allowed only after the operator submits an engineered construction/ reclamation plan and is approved by the Area Manager. The plan would address how soil productivity would be restored and how surface runoff would be treated to avoid accelerated erosion and mass wasting. Exceptions would be granted if after environmental analysis the proposed action did not fit the criteria identifying fragile soils on slopes greater than 35% or the disturbance would not result in any long-term decrease in site productivity or increased erosion.

It appears the largest problem encountered will be from salts leaching from the various soil horizons. Leached salts become available for transport during runoff events. Through the use of BMPs, this problem could be mitigated. Examples of BMPs to use would be sediment traps to filter salt and sediment, placing a berm around spoil piles to keep salt and sediment from leaving the site, and /or collecting leached salts that are available for sediment transport.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: If blowing soils become a problem the applicant may have to implement a BMP to keep the salt and sediment from being displaced.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: The soils in the area will continue to meet the Land Health Standards regardless of the proposed action.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The vegetation type is a salt desert shrub association. The predominate species include greasewood, sagebrush, shadscale, rabbitbrush, and a variety of grasses and forbs.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Impacts from the proposed action cause a direct loss of vegetation limited to the area where gravel is being recovered. Following

recovery of gravel the previous area of extraction would be reclaimed. This area would be adequately stabilized in approximately five years. The native plant community would invade the site and would achieve dominance in approximately 20 years.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no impacts.

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Following completion of the project, the vegetation community would meet the standard for plant health.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The nearest aquatic habitat is associated with the lower White River, about 0.5 mile north of the project area. This reach of river supports a warm water game (channel catfish) and nongame (a large array of native and non-native species) fisheries.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There is no reasonable probability that the proposed action would have any influence on riverine conditions. Progressive reclamation and continual site management would prevent substantive offsite soil transport and the virtually eliminate the potential for excessive sedimentation into the river.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The proposed and no-action alternative would have no effective influence on aquatic habitats and would, therefore, have no potential to influence the status of applicable land health standards.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The project site is used strictly during the later winter and early spring months by big game. During on-site inspection, evidence of winter deer use was light. This situation is not unexpected since the nearest topographic cover is over 0.5 mile from the terrace and an existing public access road bisects the site. The abundance and composition of nongame bird communities associated with these allotments' predominantly low-elevation sagebrush community are considered representative and complete with no obvious deficiencies in composition. Small mammal populations and distribution is poorly documented, however, the 6 or 7 species potentially occurring on these sites are widely distributed throughout the State and the Great Basin or Rocky Mountain regions. All of these upland associated species display broad ecological tolerance and are documented from habitats

ranging from foothill to alpine sites. No narrowly distributed or highly specialized species or subspecific populations are known to occur in these allotments.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action, due to apparently low and inconsistent levels of big game use, represents an incremental, but minor reduction in woody and herbaceous forage production for seasonal big game use. The site is currently subjected to vehicle use throughout the year such that animal displacement and habitat disuse attributable to human activity would likely remain comparable to the existing situation. Similarly, the loss of nongame habitat extent is discountable in the context of habitat available even at local landscape scales. A successfully reclaimed gravel pit on the next ridge to the east will likely offset those foregone nongame mammal and bird habitat functions within 10 years.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The surrounding uplands meet the land health standard for animal communities. Although the standards would be temporarily violated on the project site itself, the proposed action would have no adverse influence on continued meeting of the standards on surrounding rangeland. Progressive rehabilitation of the site with a combination of native and naturalized grasses has proven successful in maintaining site productivity, minimizing the proliferation of annual weeds, and predisposing the site for eventual reestablishment of native shrubs.

OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS: For the following elements, only those brought forward for analysis will be addressed further.

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Access and Transportation		X	
Cadastral Survey	X		
Fire Management	X		
Forest Management	X		
Geology and Minerals			X
Hydrology/Water Rights	X		
Law Enforcement		X	
Paleontology	X		
Rangeland Management			X
Realty Authorizations			X
Recreation		X	
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

GEOLOGY AND MINERALS

Affected Environment: Surface geology of the area is a terrace deposit of silt, sand, and gravel that overlays the cretaceous Mancos shale. Estimated depth of the overburden is 4 feet and the estimated thickness of the grave to be mined is 20 feet.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: approximately 100,000 cubic yards of gravel will be removed from the pit location changing the topography of the terrace by forming a depression.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

RANGELAND MANAGEMENT

Affected Environment: The proposed project is within the Johnson-Trujillo grazing allotment and along the White River Trail. The Trail is used to move sheep between the winter ranges along the Utah border and the summer ranges near Meeker. The Johnson-Trujillo allotment is grazed by sheep during the period December 1, to April 15. The livestock user has been grazing the area around the proposed pit during the spring in early April. The livestock trail is used by Theos Swallow Fork ranches and Nick Theos to access their allotments in Utah. Trailing occurs in the winter and spring.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There will be a loss of forage associated with this project, but this loss is inconsequential. Following reclamation the forage base would be reestablished. The project will disturb sheep using the area and sheep using the livestock trail. This disturbance would be mitigated by grazing/trailing the sheep around the project.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

REALTY AUTHORIZATIONS

Affected Environment: The proposed action is for the development of a gravel pit, which will require an access right-of-way. A Moon Lake Electric Association power line passes near the south edge of the proposed location.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Access from Rio Blanco County Road #2 to the new gravel pit will follow an existing road but will require a right-of-way. Authorization will be by an amendment to the existing COC56681.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: Construction and operation of the pit must not conflict with the maintenance and operation of the power line.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed project is within a Visual Resource Management Class IV area. The objective of class IV is to provide for management activities which require major modifications of the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape can be high. These management activities may dominate the view and be the major focus of viewer attention. However, every attempt should be made to minimize the impact of these activities through careful location, minimal disturbance, and repeating the basic elements.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The project will introduce major modifications on the visual landscape by introducing contrasting forms, colors and textures yet the proposed pit is not visible from Rio Blanco County Road 2 where the majority of potential viewers persist. The proposed action would not interfere with the class IV designation and the objectives would continue to be met.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None.

Mitigation: None.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River RMP. The cumulative impacts of sand and gravel (Mineral Material Management) are addressed in the White River RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

REFERENCES CITED;

Conner, Carl E.
2004 Class III Cultural Resources Inventory of the Proposed Rio Blanco County Road and Bridge Department's Johnson Draw Gravel Pit and Short Access. Grand River Institute, Grand Junction, Colorado.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Carol Hollowed	P & EC	Air Quality
Tamara Meagley	NRS	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern
Tamara Meagley	NRS	Threatened and Endangered Plant Species
Michael Selle	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources Paleontological Resources
Robert Fowler	Forester	Invasive, Non-Native Species
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Marty O'Mara	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Carol Hollowed	P & EC	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	ORP	Wilderness
Carol Hollowed	P & EC	Soils
Robert Fowler	Forester	Vegetation
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	ORP	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	NRS	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Robert Fowler	Forester	Rangeland Management
Linda L Jones	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	ORP	Recreation
Chris Ham	ORP	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	NRS	Wild Horses

Finding of No Significant Impact/Decision Record (FONSI/DR)

CO-110-2004-125-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)/RATIONALE: The environmental assessment and analyzing the environmental effects of the proposed action have been reviewed. The approved mitigation measures (listed below) result in a Finding of No Significant Impact on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary to further analyze the environmental effects of the proposed action.

DECISION/RATIONALE: It is my decision to approve the development of gravel pit as described in the proposed action, with mitigation listed below. This development, with mitigation, is consistent with the decisions in the White River ROD/RMP, and environmental impacts will be minimal.

MITIGATION MEASURES: 1. Require water spreading on the road surface and spoil piles to control fugitive dust and to help minimize short-term impacts. If blowing dust becomes an unmanageable problem require the disturbed areas to be covered with a fabric to avoid dust being blown into the air.

2. Construction and operation of the pit must not conflict with the maintenance and operation of the power line.

3. The operator is responsible for informing all persons who are associated with the project operations that they will be subject to prosecution for knowingly disturbing historic or archaeological sites, or for collecting artifacts. If historic or archaeological materials are uncovered during any project or construction activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities in the immediate area of the find that might further disturb such materials, and immediately contact the authorized officer (AO). Within five working days the AO will inform the operator as to:

- whether the materials appear eligible for the National Register of Historic Places
- the mitigation measures the operator will likely have to undertake before the site can be used (assuming in situ preservation is not necessary)
- a timeframe for the AO to complete an expedited review under 36 CFR 800-11 to confirm, through the State Historic Preservation Officer, that the findings of the AO are correct and that mitigation is appropriate.

If the operator wishes, at any time, to relocate activities to avoid the expense of mitigation and/or the delays associated with this process, the AO will assume responsibility for whatever recordation and stabilization of the exposed materials may be required. Otherwise, the operator will be responsible for mitigation cost. The AO will provide technical and procedural guidelines

for the conduct of mitigation. Upon verification from the AO that the required mitigation has been completed, the operator will then be allowed to resume construction.

4. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, 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.

5. From the White River, ROD/RMP of 1997, Appendix B, #179. Application of herbicides must be under field supervision of an EPA-certified pesticide applicator. Herbicides must be registered by the EPA and application proposals must be approved by the BLM.

6. If blowing soils become a problem the applicant may have to implement a BMP to keep the salt and sediment from being displaced.

NAME OF PREPARER:

[Signature] 4/20/04

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR:

Caroline P. Hallowell 9/20/04

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:

Thom E. Walter

Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

9/20/04

ATTACHMENTS: Map of the Location of the Proposed Action.

Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2004-125-EA

