

RECEIVED

DEC 07 1992

DS-252

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
CITY COUNCIL

Project Name ROBINSON RANGG IMP. Proposed Implementation Date: FALL 1992  
Proponent ROBINSON RANCH, SCS

Type and Purpose of Action THE ROBINSON RANCH IS WORKING ON A GT. PLAINS CONTRACT WITH THE SCS WHICH WILL INCLUDE STATE LAND. THE PROPOSAL IS TO CROSS FENCE THE SECTION AND DEVELOP 2 SPRINGS - THE DEVELOPMENTS WILL CONSIST OF A COLLECTION AREA, PIPING WATER TO AN AREA OUT OF THE DRAW AND PLACEMENT OF TANKS. ONE WILL REQUIRE 100' OF PIPE, THE OTHER 200'.

Location SEC. 36, T3N-R7E County PARK

N = Not present or No Impact will occur  
Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts)

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N]
2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?	[Y] DEVELOPING SPRINGS & INSTALLING WATER TROUGHS SHOULD MINIMIZE CATTLE IN THE DRAINAGES AND ULTIMATELY ENHANCE WATER QUALITY.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N]
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there significant use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N]
6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?	[Y] THERE ARE SMALL BOGGY MEAS UP AND DOWN THE DRAINAGES - DEVELOPMENT SHOULD LESSEN USE OF THOSE AREAS.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] AN ON THE GROUND SEARCH WAS CONDUCTED. OK (sp)
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	[N]
9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N]
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[M]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so estimated number	[M]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[M]
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will significant traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[M]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] THE PROJECTS WILL BE PART OF A SCS GT. PLAINS CONTRACT AND A SCS RANCH MGMT PLAN.
17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	[M]
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[M]
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[M]
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[M]
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]

22. Alternatives Considered No Action

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---

23. Public Involvement, Agencies, Groups or Individuals contacted \_\_\_\_\_

NONE

24. Other Governmental Agencies with Jurisdiction, List of Permits Needed.

SCS- 310 PERMITS

25. Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts.

THE PROJECT WILL HAVE NO NEGATIVE IMPACT. THERE WILL BE POSITIVE IMPACTS BECAUSE CATTLE WILL SPEND LESS TIME IN THE DRAWS THAT RUN WATER WHICH SHOULD LEAD TO AN INCREASE IN WATER QUALITY AND AN ENHANCEMENT OF THE NARROW RIPARIAN ZONE. THE CROSS FENCE WILL ENABLE GRAZING PRACTICES TO CONTINUE AND MAINTAIN THE GOOD CONDITION RANGES THAT CURRENTLY EXISTS. OTHER AREAS OF THE RANCH ARE NOT IN AS GOOD CONDITION SO GRAZING USE ON THE SMITH TRACT MAY INCREASE.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS       More Detailed EA       No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Prepared By: Jim Kaldowski Title Unit Mgr.  
Approved By: Garry Williams name Forest and Land Manager - (L) title

Darryl S. Williams signature 11/16/92