

**APPENDIX G.**  
**INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST**

---

# INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

**INSTRUCTIONS: Follow these instructions and then remove this text box by selecting the box with the left mouse button, then clicking on edit then cut.**

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

This Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist should be completed at an interdisciplinary team meeting to identify issues, conflicts or potential impacts that may oNPccur as a result of a proposed action. Each item of the analysis checklist will only be completed by the appropriate resource specialist – *NOT BY THE PROJECT LEADER* (unless the project leader is the appropriate specialist). For example, only the Archaeologist should fill out the sections on Cultural Resources and Native American Religious Concerns. The EA/DNA/CX preparer then uses the information from the checklist to guide preparation of the EA/DNA/CX.

## SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

### **Column 1 - Write in one of the following:**

- “NP” (*not present in project area*);
- “NI” (*present in project area but not impacted by the proposed project*)
- “PI” (*present and potentially impacted by the proposed project*) – this item or resource will be carried forward in the EA as an issue.
- “NC” (*this is for DNAs only – anticipated resource impacts are not changed from those analyzed in the original NEPA document from which you are basing the DNA*).

### **Column 2 - List of Critical Elements of the Human Environment/Resources/Other Concerns**

Critical Elements are listed first.

### **Column 3 - Date Reviewed**

Enter the date the proposed project is reviewed/checklist is filled out by that particular specialist.

### **Column 4 - Signature**

Resource specialist signs in this column (after reviewing proposed project and providing input on whether his/her particular element/resource/concern is present in the project area and may be impacted by the action).

### **Column 5 - Review Comments**

This is the rationale section. The resource specialist gives his/her reasoning for the determination made in Column 1. It should include information explaining how he/she came to their conclusion.

- *NP* - How does specialist know the element/resource/concern is not present? Site visit conducted (if so, list date of visit)? Familiarity with location? Etc.
- *NI* – What is the rationale/reason why this element/resource/concern would not be impacted by the proposed action? (See EA Template section of the Guidebook for examples.) This rationale must show that serious consideration was given as to why no impacts would be expected – “trust me” statements without substance (such as “*No impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed action*”) are not acceptable.
- *PI* – Give a brief summary of what the issue is (this will be carried forth into Chapter I of the EA as the introductory issue statement).
- *NC* – Explain why the resource impacts from the current proposed action would be the same as those in the original EA.

## INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

**Project Title:** Alton Coal EIS

**NEPA Log Number:**

**File/Serial Number:**

**Project Leader:** Keith Rigtrup

**FOR EAs/CXs:** NP: not present; NI: resource/use present but not impacted; PI: potentially impacted  
**FOR DNAs only:** NC: no change (anticipated resource impacts not changed from those analyzed in the NEPA document on which the DNA is based)

### STAFF REVIEW OF PROPOSAL:

| NP/NI/PI<br>NC           | Resource  | Date Reviewed | Signature         | Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs.<br>PIs require further analysis.)  |
|--------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------|---|
| <b>CRITICAL ELEMENTS</b> |   |               |                   |   |
| PI                       | Air Quality<br><i>(Carson)</i>  | 4/28/08       | /s/ C. Gubler     | Standard Operating procedures and other mitigating measures would need to be incorporated into the mining operation to ensure that Air quality is maintained.   |
| NP                       | Areas of Critical Environmental Concern<br><i>(Tom C.)</i>            | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen |   |
| PI                       | Cultural Resources<br><i>(Matt Z.)</i>                                | 4/25/08       | /s/ M. Zweifel    | Cultural resource inventories have been completed and numerous cultural resource sites have been identified. A Cultural Resource Management Plan detailing proposed mitigation is under development.  |
| NP                       | Environmental Justice<br><i>(Keith)</i>                               | 4/28/08       | /s/ K. Rigtrup    | No low income or minority populations in the project area.  |
| NP                       | Farmlands (Prime or Unique)<br><i>(John)</i>                          | 4/25/08       | /s/ J. Reese      |   |
| NI                       | Floodplains<br><i>(Carson)</i>  | 4/28/08       | /s./ C. Gubler    | Flood plains will be put back the same, and on site mitigation will take place as a result of compliance with UDOGM.  |
| PI                       | Invasive, Non-native Species<br><i>(Carson)</i>                       | 4/28/08       | /s./ C. Gubler    | Some invasives are found within the LBA, the potential for them to increase is there if mitigating measures are not taken.  |
| PI                       | Native American Religious Concerns<br><i>(Matt Z.)</i>                | 4/25/08       | /s/ M. Zweifel    | Initial Native American consultation has been performed, and will be updated as required. Comments regarding the potential loss of cultural resource sites have been received from at least one Tribe, and Tribal comments and input to the Cultural Resources Management Plan will be sought when a draft plan is available. |
| NI                       | Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species<br><i>(Carson)</i>  | 4/28/08       | /s/ C. Gubler     | No Threatened Endangered or Candidate Plant species are known to exist within the project area.   |
| PI                       | Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Wildlife Species<br><i>(Lisa)</i> | 4/24/08       | /s/L. Church      | Current USFWS list needs to be utilized for analysis. Presence and absence of habitat would need to be determined. No known T and E or C animals in the project area, wintering raptors ie Bald Eagles, may utilize habitat for wintering roosting.   |
| PI                       | Wastes (hazardous or solid)<br><i>(Doug P.)</i>                       | 4/25/2008     | /s/ Doug Powell   | Large industrial operations such as the proposed action have a potential for solid and hazardous waste issues. Standard operating procedures and other mitigating measures would need to be incorporated.   |

| NP/NI/PI<br>NC                     | Resource   | Date Reviewed | Signature         | Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs.<br>PIs require further analysis.)  |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------|-------------------|---|
| PI                                 | Water Quality<br>(drinking/ground) ( <i>Carson</i> )           | 4/28/08       | /s/ C. Gubler     | The potential exists for Water Quality to be degraded or impacted as a result of this action. Mitigating measures would need to be incorporated into the project to ensure water quality above and below ground are not impacted.   |
| PI                                 | Wetlands/Riparian Zones<br>( <i>Lisa</i> )                     | 4/24/08       | /s/ L.Church      | Portions of Robinson Creek may be temporarily diverted for life of project will be 404 permitted and restored. Mitigations and reclamation plans would be part of project.  |
| NP                                 | Wild and Scenic Rivers<br>( <i>Tom C.</i> )                    | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen |   |
| NP                                 | Wilderness<br>( <i>Tom C.</i> )                                | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen |   |
| <b>OTHER RESOURCES / CONCERNS*</b> |  |               |                   |   |
| PI                                 | Rangeland Health Standards<br>and Guidelines ( <i>Carson</i> ) | 4/28/08       | /s/ C. Gubler     | Rangeland Health standards and Guidelines will be affected by the proposed action. Reclamation will have to occur to ensure that the land is returned to a functioning state.   |
| PI                                 | Livestock Grazing<br>( <i>John</i> )                           | 4/28/08       | /s/ J. Reese      | Livestock grazing in the project area may be impacted during mining activities; mitigation may be required with grazing permittees. Reclamation planning would need to consider reconstructing all fences and other range improvements located within effected area.  |
| PI                                 | Woodland / Forestry<br>( <i>John</i> )                         | 4/28/08       | /s/ J. Reese      | Woodland/Forestry in the project area would be impacted by mining activities. The removal of invaded Pinyon and Juniper trees would be a positive impact on the land.   |
| PI                                 | Vegetation<br>( <i>John</i> )                                  | 4/28/08       | /s/ J. Reese      | Vegetation in the project area would be impacted by mining activities. Reclamation planning must include a re-vegetation and reseedling plan using species currently on site along with others the BLM specialists feel appropriate for the site.   |
| PI                                 | Fish and Wildlife<br>( <i>Lisa</i> )                           | 4/24/08       | /s/L.Church       | Sage grouse and brooding and winter habitat in the project area may be impacted by mining activities, mitigations could be required. Reclamation planning would need to consider this species, deer, elk, turkeys and other sagebrush obligates, including pygmy rabbits. Raptors may utilize are winter roosting , and or nesting. |
| PI                                 | Soils<br>( <i>John</i> )                                       | 4/28/08       | /s/ J. Reese      | Soils in the project area would be impacted by the mining activities. Reclamation planning must consider a soil stabilization plan which may include re-contouring and the construction of water bars where appropriate. (see vegetation) for re-vegetation requirements.   |
| PI                                 | Recreation<br>( <i>Tom C.</i> )                                | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen | Minor occasional recreation uses/activities (hunting, nature study, photography, etc.) would be impacted on project site itself. Recreation on adjacent public lands would be affected somewhat by noise, dust and visual intrusions from mining operation.   |
| PI                                 | Visual Resources<br>( <i>Tom C.</i> )                          | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen | Substantial visual contrast expected due to nature of operation and size of disturbance area. Visual contrasts would remain until site portions are rehabilitated after removal of coal layer.  |
| PI                                 | Geology / Mineral Resources<br>( <i>Doug P.</i> )              | 4/25/2008     | /s/ Doug Powell   | Geologic and mineral resources would be impacted by the proposed action. Geologic hazards relating to mining may also exist.  |
|                                    | Paleontology<br>( <i>Alan T.</i> )                             |               |                   |   |
| PI                                 | Lands / Access<br>( <i>Hugh</i> )                              | 4/28/2008     | /s/ Hugh Wolfe    | Possible Re-routing of the county road would be needed. This would create the need for a temporary FLPMA Tile V right-of-way for the length of the project.   |

| NP/NI/PI<br>NC | Resource                               | Date Reviewed | Signature         | Review Comments (required for all NIs and PIs.<br>PIs require further analysis.)   |
|----------------|--|---------------|-------------------|--|
| PI             | Fuels / Fire Management<br>(Carson)    | 4/28/08       | /s/ C. Gubler     | Fuels and Fire management may be impacted by the proposed action, however most impacts would be positive as invaded Pinyon Juniper lands are cleared.  |
| PI             | Socio-economics<br>(Keith)             | 4/28/08       | /s/ K. Rigtrup    | The mining operations would have beneficial economic impacts to local and state tax revenue as well as to local businesses. There could also be social impacts with new workers moving into local communities. |
| NP             | Wilderness characteristics<br>(Tom C.) | 4/25/08       | /s/T. Christensen |  |

**FINAL REVIEW:**

| Reviewer Title            | Date | Signature | Comments |
|---------------------------|------|-----------|----------|
| NEPA Coordinator (Dennis) |      |           |          |
| Manager ( )               |      |           |          |

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

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