

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Otty Wagonhound Pipeline
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

June 2015

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Worland Field Office



Worksheet: Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior– Bureau of Land Management

Introduction

OFFICE: Worland Field Office, Wind River Bighorn Basin District, Wyoming

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2015-0010-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: RIPS – 018448

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Otty Wagonhound Pipeline – livestock watering pipeline with tanks

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Wagonhound drainage of Cottonwood Creek, T45N R99W Sec 27, 33, 34, and 35 and in T44N R99W Sec 3, Hot Springs County, Wyoming

APPLICANT (if any): Prospect Land and Cattle Co.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The Otty Wagonhound Pipeline would provide water for livestock and wildlife in 3 grazing allotments (Lower Pastures, Wales Homestead, and Urwin Homestead). The water would serve the Wales Homestead, Urwin Homestead, West Dugout, and Middle Dugout pastures of the Prospect Land and Cattle ranch.

The pipeline would transport spring water from Pershal and Cabin Springs, springs that are on deeded land, by gravity flow to 4 watering tanks. This pipeline would be an extension of the Prospect South and Wagonhound pipelines and spring developments that are on deeded land owned by Prospect Land and Cattle. The pipeline would be about 25,854 feet (4.9 miles) long of 1.5 inch polyethylene pipe. The troughs would be 12 foot diameter rubber tire tanks. Only one of the tanks and about 1,350 feet (0.26 miles) of the pipeline would be on BLM lands the rest would be on private and state of Wyoming lands.

Pipe installation would be done using a caterpillar tractor and plowing in the pipe to a depth of 24-36 inches. This method of pipe installation would be used to decrease the amount of surface disturbance and increase the probability of reclamation. The tank locations would require minor leveling. A majority of the pipeline would follow existing two-track roads.

Water would be left flowing in the springs that feed the pipeline at all times to prevent drying up of the associated riparian areas. Tanks would use floats to regulate water level and aide in keeping flowing water at the springs used to feed the pipeline.

All equipment will be inspected and cleaned for noxious and invasive weeds prior to entering the project area. When plowing in the pipeline there will be minimal ground disturbance. After the ripping operation the D-6 Caterpillar tractor will be run back over the plowed area to compact and restore the area to its original profile. Drains and vents will be installed in the system using a Yanmar track hoe to dig a small trench. Dirt will be replaced in the trench and compacted to the original profile. The areas disturbed by the operations will be seeded with native grasses and the area monitored the next year for any noxious weeds. Any found noxious weeds will be treated and reported to the BLM.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

Name of Plan: Grass Creek Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved: September, 1998

“All BLM livestock grazing permittee’s and other interested parties, including local conservation districts, would implement management actions such as the use of grazing systems, land treatments, and range improvements consistent with the Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. (See Appendix 2). Proposal and design of these actions would normally be developed through activity and implementation plans such as coordinated activity plans (CAPs), coordinated resource management plans (CRMs), allotment management plans (AMPs), or holistic resource management plans (HRMs). The BLM would give priority to activity planning on “I” category allotments.” [Page 13]

BLM Wyoming Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management (Appendix 2 of RMP)

“...The effects of new range improvements (water developments, fences, etc.) on the health and function of rangelands would be carefully considered prior to their implementation.” [Number 6, page 51]

“Grazing management practices and range improvements would be designed to maintain or promote the physical and biological conditions necessary to sustain native animal populations and plant communities....” [Number 8, page 51]

Procedures for Range Development Projects (Appendix 5 of RMP)

“Range projects would be developed with grazing management strategies to achieve resource management objectives....” [Page 79]

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Twentyone Creek Pipeline Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2013-0069-EA
July 8, 2014

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the new proposed action is almost identical to the proposed action or Alternative 1 that was selected in the Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA. The only difference would be that the Otty Wagonhound Pipeline proposed action would not involve the development of any springs. The new proposed action is in terrain, habitat, and vegetation types that are the same as those analyzed in the Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA. The Otty Wagonhound Pipeline proposed action would be in the next drainage northeast of the Twentyone Creek Pipeline, approximately 4.5 miles north-east of the farthest east tank of the Twentyone Creek Pipeline.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) is the same. The proposed action, a no action, and an action with modifications from that proposed were analyzed in the Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA. The new proposed action would have the same or less environmental concerns and resource values because the Otty Wagonhound Pipeline proposal does not fall within elk crucial winter range or follow a historic stage route as parts of the Twentyone Creek Pipeline did.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the existing analysis is still valid. There is no known “new” information that would affect the analysis contained in the existing NEPA document.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. All effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action are both quantitatively and qualitatively similar to those analyzed in the Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA. Acreage would be substantially less in for the Otty Wagonhound Pipeline because only four tanks would be installed and 25,854 feet of pipe versus the 8 tanks and 41,184 feet of pipe that was analyzed in the Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA. Also, the new proposed action would only install one of the tanks and about 1,350 feet of pipe on BLM lands, the rest would be installed on deeded land and State of Wyoming land. The new proposed action would impact BLM lands and resources the same as those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) is adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

The Worland BLM ID Team has reviewed the DNA and existing NEPA document for conformance. The Twentyone Creek Pipeline EA was also made available to all of the Interested Publics when the Proposed Decision was made. The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Thermopolis Field Office, Wyoming State Engineers Office, Wyoming State Lands and Investments, and the Wyoming Water Development Commission have all been consulted by the applicant about the new proposed project.

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

BLM Staff Consulted

Resource	Name	Title
Cultural Resources	Dora Ridenour	Archaeologist
Fish/Wildlife (including T&E)	Tim Stephens	Wildlife Biologist
Recreation/VRM/Travel Management/Special Designations	Holly Elliott	P&EC
Rangeland/Vegetation	Derek Trauntvein	Range Management Specialist
T&E Plants	Karen Hepp	Range Management Specialist (T&E/Sensitive Plants)
Engineering	Monica Goepferd/ Jim Critz	Civil Engineer
Fluid Minerals	Darci Stafford	Natural Resource Specialist
Water resources	Jared Dalebout	Hydrologist
Paleontology	Dora Ridenour	Archaeologist
Geology & Minerals	Alex Jensen Frank Sanders	Geologist Petroleum Engineer
Land Use/Access	Rita Allen/ Leta Rinker	Realty Specialist
Fire Ecology	Eve Warren	Natural Resource Specialist
Forests	Jim Gates	Forester
Public Health and Safety	Alex Jensen Darci Stafford	Geologist NRS
Socioeconomics	Holly Elliott	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Air Quality	Holly Elliott	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Minerals and Lands	Cathy Wolff-White	Assistant Field Manager
Resources	Michael Phillips	Assistant Field Manager

Conclusion *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

“ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead /s/Derek Trauntvein

Signature of NEPA Coordinator /s/Holly Elliott

Signature of the Responsible Official: /s/Rebecca A. Good Date June 16, 2015

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.