

**U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Theodore Roosevelt National Park**



**U.S. Department of Agriculture
U.S. Forest Service
Dakota Prairie Grasslands**

Replacement of a Communications Tower in Theodore Roosevelt National Park and U.S. Forest Service Access Road Improvement

**Environmental Assessment
December 2005**

Environmental Assessment: Abstract

Replacement of a Communications Tower in Theodore Roosevelt National Park and U.S. Forest Service Access Road Improvement

Summary

This environmental assessment (EA) was prepared to evaluate the potential impacts on the physical and human environment that could result from the proposed action and alternatives to that action. The proposed action is the issuance of a right-of-way permit by the National Park Service (NPS), Theodore Roosevelt National Park (TRNP), and the issuance of a Private Road Special Use Permit by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS), Dakota Prairie Grasslands (DPG), Medora Ranger District. The proposed permits would be issued to Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP doing business as (dba) Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless) to replace an existing radio tower (currently supporting a NPS radio repeater) with a telecommunications tower, and to install a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed in the TRNP. Verizon Wireless also would reconstruct and maintain approximately 1.6 miles of National Forest System Road (NFSR) #730A-2 on National Forest System (NFS) land in Sections 17 and 18, T140N, R102W, Billings County, North Dakota. This EA evaluates the impacts of the proposed action and the no action alternative on physical, biological, heritage and cultural, and social resources.

Public Comment

If you wish to comment on the EA, you may mail comments to the name and address below. This EA will be on public review for 30 days. Please note that names and addresses of people who comment become part of the public record. **If you wish us to withhold your name and/or address, you must state this prominently at the beginning of your comment.** The entirety of any submission from an organization, business, or individual identifying himself/herself as a representative or official of an organization or business will be made available for public inspection.

Valerie Naylor, Superintendent
Theodore Roosevelt National Park
P.O. Box 7
Medora, North Dakota 58645
(701) 623-4466
thro_forum@nps.gov

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document is an environmental assessment (EA) for the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) National Park Service (NPS)—the lead agency—and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS)—a cooperating agency. It assesses potential environmental, social, and economic impacts on the natural and human-made environments that would result from implementing the proposed action or no action alternative.

The proposed action is to issue permits allowing (1) replacement of an existing radio tower (currently supporting a NPS radio repeater) with a telecommunications tower, and (2) installation of a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park (TRNP), in the Little Missouri Badlands, west-central North Dakota (NPS 2004). The existing radio tower currently supports NPS communications equipment; the proposed tower replacement would support both NPS communications equipment and Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP doing business as (dba) Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless) cellular telephone equipment. The proposed action also includes reconstruction and future maintenance of approximately 1.6 miles of National Forest System Road (NFSR) #730A-2 on National Forest System (NFS) land in Sections 17 and 18, T140N, R102W, Billings County, North Dakota. Verizon Wireless and its contractors would be responsible for management and cost of all proposed construction work and long-term maintenance of the road and proposed facility. This analysis will help the NPS, TRNP, and the FS, Dakota Prairie Grasslands (DPG), Medora Ranger District decide whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and whether to issue to Verizon Wireless a right-of-way permit (responsibility of NPS) and a Private Road Special Use Permit (responsibility of FS).

The purpose of the proposed action—issuance of right-of-way and Private Road Special Use Permits by the NPS and FS, respectively—is to ensure installation of the proposed telecommunications system in a manner that will not conflict with the goals and purposes of the TRNP and DPG. The proposed action would satisfy the growing demand for commercial and personal communication in the area by providing high capability, digital voice and data transmission via cellular telephones. Meeting this demand requires installation of state-of-the-art telecommunication and antenna facilities.

Impacts on the physical, biological, heritage and cultural, and social resources of the project area and region are assessed, including:

- Physical resources: ecological and watershed settings, soil and water resources, and air quality (including noise)
- Biological resources: vegetation; wildlife and fisheries; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
- Heritage and cultural resources
- Social resources: wilderness, scenery resources, transportation and roads, and recreation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	I
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS	III
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	V
CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION.....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.1.1 <i>Summary of the Proposed Action</i>	1
1.1.2 <i>Summary of Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations</i>	1
1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED	3
1.3 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING DOCUMENTS.....	3
1.4 SCOPE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	5
1.4.1 <i>Scoping Process</i>	5
1.4.2 <i>Key Issues and Impact Topics</i>	5
1.4.3 <i>Other Issues Not Considered in Detail with Rationale</i>	6
1.4.4 <i>Issues Involving Resources Not Applicable to Proposed Action or No Action Alternative</i>	6
1.5 DECISION TO BE MADE.....	7
CHAPTER 2: THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES.....	8
2.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	8
2.1.1 <i>The No Action Alternative</i>	8
2.1.2 <i>The Proposed Action</i>	8
2.1.3 <i>Comparison of Alternatives</i>	9
2.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS	9
CHAPTER 3: THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	12
3.1 PHYSICAL RESOURCES.....	12
3.1.1 <i>Ecological Setting</i>	12
3.1.2 <i>Watershed Setting</i>	14
3.1.3 <i>Soil Resources</i>	15
3.1.4 <i>Water Resources</i>	15
3.1.5 <i>Air Quality and Noise</i>	16
3.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	16
3.2.1 <i>Vegetation</i>	16
3.2.2 <i>Wildlife and Fisheries</i>	17
3.2.3 <i>Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species</i>	18
3.3 HERITAGE AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	18
3.4 SOCIAL RESOURCES.....	20
3.4.1 <i>Wilderness</i>	20
3.4.2 <i>Scenery Resources</i>	21
3.4.3 <i>Transportation and Roads</i>	21
3.4.4 <i>Recreation</i>	22
CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	23
4.1 PHYSICAL RESOURCES.....	24
4.1.1 <i>Ecological Setting</i>	25
4.1.2 <i>Watershed Setting</i>	26

4.1.3	<i>Soil Resources</i>	27
4.1.4	<i>Water Resources</i>	30
4.1.5	<i>Air Quality and Noise</i>	33
4.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	34
4.2.1	<i>Vegetation</i>	35
4.2.2	<i>Wildlife and Fisheries</i>	36
4.2.3	<i>Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species</i>	38
4.3	HERITAGE AND CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	44
4.4	SOCIAL RESOURCES.....	46
4.4.1	<i>Wilderness</i>	46
4.4.2	<i>Scenery Resources</i>	48
4.4.3	<i>Transportation and Roads</i>	50
4.4.4	<i>Recreation</i>	51
CHAPTER 5: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION		53
5.1	AGENCIES, TRIBES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS CONTACTED.....	53
5.2	LIST OF PREPARERS	53
REFERENCES		REF-1

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Public Involvement
Appendix B	Tower, Site, and Road Specifications
Appendix C	Photographic Log
Appendix D	Photographic Simulations

TABLES

TABLE 1-1:	ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS RELATED TO EACH ISSUE
TABLE 2-1:	COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES
TABLE 3-1:	CLIMATE DATA FOR MEDORA, NORTH DAKOTA
TABLE 3-2	CLIMATE DATA FOR MOTT, NORTH DAKOTA
TABLE 3-3:	SPECIES OF CONCERN IN THE REGION AND POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN THE PROJECT AREA
TABLE 3-4:	RESULTS OF HISTORICAL RECORD SEARCH AND PREVIOUS INVENTORIES
TABLE 4-1:	STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR SOIL RESOURCES
TABLE 4-2:	ESTIMATED EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION FROM THE ROAD RECONSTRUCTION
TABLE 4-3:	STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR WATER RESOURCES

FIGURES

FIGURE 1:	SITE VICINITY MAP
FIGURE 2:	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS AREA BOUNDARY

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
CE	Cumulative Effect
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
dba	Doing Business As
DM	Departmental Manual
DO	Director's Order
DoH	Department of Health
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DPG	Dakota Prairie Grasslands
EA	Environmental Assessment
Earthworks	Earthworks Archaeology & Environmental Investigative Services
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FCC	Federal Communications Commission
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FR	Federal Register
FS	Forest Service
FSH	Forest Service Handbook
FSWEPP	Forest Service Water Erosion Prediction Model
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan
MA	Management Area
MS #	Survey Code Number
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NASIS	National Soil Information System
ND	North Dakota
NDGF	North Dakota Game and Fish Department
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFMA	National Forest Management Act
NFSR	National Forest System Road
NFS	National Forest System
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resource Conservation Service
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
S&G	Standards and Guidelines
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SITS #	Site Number
TECM	Temporary Erosion Control Measures
Tetra Tech	Tetra Tech EM Inc.
TRNP	Theodore Roosevelt National Park
U.S.	United States
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
Verizon Wireless	Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP doing business as Verizon Wireless
WEPP	Water Erosion Prediction Model

CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

This document is an environmental assessment (EA) for the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) National Park Service (NPS)—the lead agency—and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS)—a cooperating agency. It assesses potential environmental, social, and economic impacts on the natural and human-made environments that would result from implementing the proposed action or no action alternative.

This chapter presents the background on and information about the proposed action; the purpose and need of the proposed action; relationships of this EA to other environmental and planning documents; the scope of the environmental analyses; and the decision to be made by the NPS and FS.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The proposed action and compliance with applicable laws and regulations are summarized below. The proposed action is described in more detail in Section 2.0.

1.1.1 Summary of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to issue permits allowing (1) replacement of an existing radio tower (currently supporting a NPS radio repeater) with a telecommunications tower, and (2) installation of a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park (TRNP), in the Little Missouri Badlands, west-central North Dakota (NPS 2004). The existing radio tower currently supports NPS communications equipment; the proposed tower replacement would support both NPS communications equipment and Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP doing business as (dba) Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless) cellular telephone equipment. The proposed action also includes reconstruction and future maintenance of approximately 1.6 miles of National Forest System Road (NFSR) #730A-2 on National Forest System (NFS) land in Sections 17 and 18, T140N, R102W, Billings County, North Dakota (see Figure 1). Verizon Wireless and its contractors would be responsible for management and cost of all proposed construction work and long-term maintenance of the road and proposed facility. This analysis will help the NPS, TRNP, and the FS, Dakota Prairie Grasslands (DPG), Medora Ranger District decide whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and whether to issue to Verizon Wireless a right-of-way permit (responsibility of NPS) and a Private Road Special Use Permit (responsibility of FS).

1.1.2 Summary of Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations

Because a private company would undertake the proposed action on federal land and would require two permits from the agencies that manage the federal land, Verizon Wireless must comply with the requirements set forth under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, in accordance with the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for implementation of NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] parts 1500 through 1508). Verizon Wireless also must comply with applicable NPS and FS regulations and guidelines for implementing NEPA, including the DOI Departmental Manual (DM) Part 516; NPS Director's Order 12 (DO-12) and the DO-12 Handbook; USDA NEPA regulations (7 CFR 1b); 36 CFR 215 (which deals with the FS comment and appeals process); the *Forest Service Manual* (Section 1950); the *Forest Service Handbook* (FSH) (Section 1909.15, Chapters 10, 40, and 60); and the *Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook* for forest planning, ecosystem management, and planning for multiple uses of FS lands.

CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

This document is an environmental assessment (EA) for the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) National Park Service (NPS)—the lead agency—and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS)—a cooperating agency. It assesses potential environmental, social, and economic impacts on the natural and human-made environments that would result from implementing the proposed action or no action alternative.

This chapter presents the background on and information about the proposed action; the purpose and need of the proposed action; relationships of this EA to other environmental and planning documents; the scope of the environmental analyses; and the decision to be made by the NPS and FS.

1.1 BACKGROUND

The proposed action and compliance with applicable laws and regulations are summarized below. The proposed action is described in more detail in Section 2.0.

1.1.1 Summary of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is to issue permits allowing (1) replacement of an existing radio tower (currently supporting a NPS radio repeater) with a telecommunications tower, and (2) installation of a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed in the Theodore Roosevelt National Park (TRNP), in the Little Missouri Badlands, west-central North Dakota (NPS 2004). The existing radio tower currently supports NPS communications equipment; the proposed tower replacement would support both NPS communications equipment and Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP doing business as (dba) Verizon Wireless (Verizon Wireless) cellular telephone equipment. The proposed action also includes reconstruction and future maintenance of approximately 1.6 miles of National Forest System Road (NFSR) #730A-2 on National Forest System (NFS) land in Sections 17 and 18, T140N, R102W, Billings County, North Dakota (see Figure 1). Verizon Wireless and its contractors would be responsible for management and cost of all proposed construction work and long-term maintenance of the road and proposed facility. This analysis will help the NPS, TRNP, and the FS, Dakota Prairie Grasslands (DPG), Medora Ranger District decide whether to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) and whether to issue to Verizon Wireless a right-of-way permit (responsibility of NPS) and a Private Road Special Use Permit (responsibility of FS).

1.1.2 Summary of Compliance with Applicable Laws and Regulations

Because a private company would undertake the proposed action on federal land and would require two permits from the agencies that manage the federal land, Verizon Wireless must comply with the requirements set forth under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, in accordance with the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) for implementation of NEPA (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] parts 1500 through 1508). Verizon Wireless also must comply with applicable NPS and FS regulations and guidelines for implementing NEPA, including the DOI Departmental Manual (DM) Part 516; NPS Director's Order 12 (DO-12) and the DO-12 Handbook; USDA NEPA regulations (7 CFR 1b); 36 CFR 215 (which deals with the FS comment and appeals process); the *Forest Service Manual* (Section 1950); the *Forest Service Handbook* (FSH) (Section 1909.15, Chapters 10, 40, and 60); and the *Environmental Policy and Procedures Handbook* for forest planning, ecosystem management, and planning for multiple uses of FS lands.






FIGURE 1 - SITE VICINITY MAP

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REPLACEMENT OF A COMMUNICATIONS TOWER IN THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK
AND U.S. FOREST SERVICE ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENT



- Proposed 180' Guyed Tower
- Existing Road to be Improved
- Existing Fenced Compound



Prepared by Tetra Tech EM Inc.
Created using ArcMap 9.0
GCS North_American 1927 Albers



1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed action—issuance of right-of-way and Private Road Special Use Permits by the NPS and FS, respectively—is to ensure installation of the proposed telecommunications system in a manner that will not conflict with the goals and purposes of the TRNP and DPG, which are discussed in the management plans of those units (see Section 1.3). The goals and purposes of the TRNP are to protect and conserve the natural, scenic, and historic resources of the region from unnecessary disturbances. The goals and objectives of the DPG provide direction regarding the type and amount of goods and services that are to be produced on the DPG and focus on achieving ecosystem health and ecological integrity. The need for the proposed action is to address the application by Verizon Wireless for a right-of-way permit, as required by NPS DO-53 and other pertinent legislation and regulations, such as the Telecommunications Act (<http://www.fcc.gov/telecom.html>) and applicable Federal Communication Commission (FCC) regulations (<http://wireless.fcc.gov/siting/environmental-assessment.html>) and FS regulations.

The proposed action would satisfy the growing demand for commercial and personal communication in the region by providing high capability, digital voice and data transmission via cellular telephones. Verizon Wireless applied for the special use permits to replace the existing NPS radio tower with a new tower capable of supporting new telecommunications equipment and NPS radio equipment. This new tower would provide additional cellular coverage and commercial use of the Verizon Wireless telecommunication system in the area and continued use of the radio repeater by the NPS (see Section 2.1.2). Moreover, NFSR #730A-2 would be reconstructed to provide safer access to the existing NPS facility and proposed location of the new telecommunication equipment for construction, operation, and maintenance.

1.3 RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING DOCUMENTS

The NPS and FS apply several environmental and planning documents to encourage management decisions that would maintain sound environmental and natural resource practices on federal lands. The proposed action and no action alternative are both consistent with the management direction set forth in the environmental and planning documents. This EA was prepared in accordance with the following existing environmental and planning documents and hereby incorporates them by reference:

NPS TRNP General Management Plan

TRNP is dedicated to the preservation and public enjoyment of important historic, prehistoric, cultural, scenic, and natural resources (NPS 1987). TRNP is managed to protect and interpret the badlands ecosystem surrounding the Little Missouri River and the cultural resources resulting from human habitation of the area. The park was established as a memorial to honor Theodore Roosevelt, who significantly contributed to the conservation movement and development of the western U.S. Specifically, TRNP was established to:

- Memorialize and preserve the life, times, and philosophy of Theodore Roosevelt in the North Dakota Badlands
- Conserve unimpaired the scenery and the natural and cultural resources, and facilitate scientific interests in TRNP
- Provide for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the people

- Manage the Theodore Roosevelt wilderness as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The NPS TRNP General Management Plan provides the necessary strategies to guide management, use, and development of TRNP. The plan addresses resource management in the park, with particular attention to flood protection, bison management, historic building preservation, and visitor use needs. Several strategies presented in the plan include expanding trails, upgrading sanitation facilities, developing facilities for horse users and the handicapped, and increasing visitor contact and interpretive opportunities (NPS 1987).

NPS TRNP Resource Management Plan

The TRNP Resource Management Plan describes the natural and cultural resources within TRNP, as well as management activities for safeguarding those resources. A wide variety of research initiatives, baseline surveys, and manipulative and protective techniques are integrated into a comprehensive resource management program that this plan describes. The Resource Management Plan describes the park's strategic long-range management goals for its resources. This vision provides the context for setting priorities and implementing both ongoing programs and short-term projects. The Resource Management Plan can also be used to measure and track progress toward long-term goals and adjust resource management actions to keep pace with developing technologies and techniques (NPS 1994).

FS Dakota Prairie Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan

The Dakota Prairie Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) is designed to improve the capability of the Nation's forests and grasslands to provide a desired level of uses, values, products, and services. It also presents the goals, objectives, management standards, and guidelines for the area (FS 2001a). The DPG LRMP provides guidance for all resource management activities on the DPG. It identifies management standards and guidelines; and describes resource management practices, levels of resource use and protection, and availability and suitability of lands for resource management. The DPG LRMP embodies the provisions of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), the implementing regulations, and other guiding documents. The land-use determinations, management area prescriptions, and standards and guidelines are statements of the management direction for the DPG.

The LRMP describes different management areas (MA), and the proposed project is located within MA 3.65, *Rangelands with Diverse Natural-Appearing Landscapes*. This MA emphasizes maintaining or restoring a diversity of desired plants and animals and ecological processes and functions. It also provides a mix of other rangeland values and uses with limits on facilities to maintain a natural appearing landscape. These areas have relatively few livestock grazing developments, such as fences and water tanks, resulting in a mosaic of livestock grazing patterns and diverse vegetation composition and structure. Livestock graze most areas annually, but some areas receive little or no grazing due to topography. Riparian areas and streams will move toward properly functioning condition and have few human-caused alterations. Restored riparian areas and streams will be evident. Prescribed fire is used as a management tool, although fires (including wildfires) are aggressively controlled. Natural outbreaks of native insects and diseases are allowed to proceed without intervention unless they substantially threaten high-value resources. Natural appearing landscapes predominate; however, oil and gas development may occur and are visually subordinate to the landscape (FS 2001a).

FS Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Northern Great Plains Management Plans Revision

The FS *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Northern Great Plains Management Plans Revision* provides environmental impact analyses for management plan revisions for three participating administrative units, including the Dakota Prairie Grasslands (FS 2001b).

1.4 SCOPE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The project area analyzed in this EA is the tract of land currently supporting the existing TRNP radio tower facility and NFSR #730A-2. The scope of the analysis set forth in this EA is limited to the proposed additions to the existing TRNP radio tower facility and the proposed reconstruction and future maintenance of NFSR #730A-2. Where applicable and possible, and to facilitate as complete an impact analysis as possible, information about areas outside the boundaries of federally managed land has been included. This EA will remain valid until the NPS and FS determine that a new action, new unforeseen significant issues, or new alternatives with different environmental consequences must be analyzed. At that time, this analysis and document would be revised pursuant to NEPA.

1.4.1 Scoping Process

Scoping is an early and open process to determine the breadth of environmental issues and alternatives to be addressed in an EA. The NPS conducted internal scoping and completed an Environmental Screening Form on December 3, 2004. The NPS did not require public (external to the agency) scoping for the proposed project under that agency's regulations. However, the FS did require public scoping for this project, which was conducted by the FS only on the proposed upgrade of existing NFSR #730A-2 by Verizon Wireless. The FS conducted internal scoping in September 2004 and began public scoping on September 30, 2004. On this date, the FS sent a public scoping letter to 56 interested individuals and organizations. The letter included a description of the proposed action and contact information to submit comments. The public scoping period for this project ended on October 30, 2004. Three comment letters were received. Comments received were analyzed by coding each statement by subject, comment type, and disposition. This analysis was conducted using Microsoft Access database software. Additional information regarding the scoping process is presented in Appendix A.

1.4.2 Key Issues and Impact Topics

Issues are questions or statements about the relationship between the proposed action and the natural or cultural environment. Examining issues requires describing the relationship between a proposed action and the environment (NPS 2004). Issues do not specify the context, potential impacts, or intensity of potential impacts; issues simply state that a relationship exists between the proposed action and specific environmental, cultural, and social resources, and are used to determine impact topics examined in the EA. Table 1 presents the issues identified during the scoping process and the impact topics related to each issue and examined in the EA.

Key issues are used to formulate alternatives, prescribe mitigation measures, or analyze environmental consequences. These issues are key because of the extent of their geographic distribution, the potential duration of their effects, or the potential intensity of interest or resource conflict (FS 2004). Based on review and analysis of the public and internal scoping comments received, no key issues are associated with the proposed action. Therefore, the issues identified above and their relationships to specific resource topics serve as the basis for the analyses presented in the EA.

**TABLE 1-1
ISSUES AND IMPACT TOPICS RELATED TO EACH ISSUE**

Issue	Impact Topics Related to Each Issue
Potential impacts on the long-term integrity of natural systems and processes	Ecological Setting Watershed Setting Soil Resources Water Resources Air Quality and Noise Vegetation Wildlife and Fisheries Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species
Potential impacts on traditional land uses	Ecological Setting Watershed Setting
Potential impacts resulting from erosion and soil compaction	Soil Resources Water Resources Transportation and Roads
Potential impacts on water bodies, floodplains, and riparian habitat	Water Resources Wildlife and Fisheries
Potential impacts on air quality and natural soundscapes	Air Quality and Noise
Preservation and protection of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species	Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species
Potential impacts on the long-term integrity of cultural, historic, and archeological resources	Heritage and cultural resources
Potential impacts on wilderness	Wilderness
Potential impacts on viewsheds	Scenery Resources
Potential impacts on traditional recreational activities	Recreation Transportation and Roads

1.4.3 Other Issues Not Considered in Detail with Rationale

Other issues not considered in detail have been identified by the agencies or the public but not used in the environmental analysis for various reasons (FS 2004). Appendix A presents the issues not considered in detail and the rationale for not including them as impact topics.

1.4.4 Issues Involving Resources Not Applicable to Proposed Action or No Action Alternative

Several issues involving resources that would possibly require analysis according to statute and regulation were found not applicable to the proposed action or no action alternative. These resources are prime and unique farmlands; hazardous materials and waste; and socioeconomic and environmental justice resources. The rationale for not considering these resources in this document is as follows.

Prime and Unique Farmlands

In August 1980, the CEQ directed that federal agencies must assess the effects of their actions on farmland soils classified by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as prime or unique. Prime or unique farmland is defined as soil that particularly produces general crops such as common foods, forage, fiber, and oil seed; unique farmland produces specialty crops such as fruits,

vegetables, and nuts. According to NRCS, none of the soils in the project area is classified as prime and unique farmlands. Therefore, the topic of prime and unique farmlands was dismissed as an impact topic in this document.

Hazardous Materials and Waste

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted in accordance with the *Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process*, American Society for Testing and Materials designation E 1527-00 (Tetra Tech EM Inc. [Tetra Tech] 2004). No recognized environmental conditions (REC) were identified from review of historical records, review of environmental databases, site reconnaissance, or interviews. Based on the results of the Phase I ESA, hazardous materials and waste were dismissed as impact topics in this document.

Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice Resources

The proposed action would neither change local and regional land use nor impact local businesses or other agencies. The project area is not located near any residences, businesses, or significant socioeconomic resources. Therefore, the socioeconomic environment will not be addressed as an impact topic in this document.

Executive Order 12898, "General Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations," requires all federal agencies to incorporate environmental justice into their missions by identifying and addressing disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs and policies on minorities and low-income populations and communities. The proposed action would not have health or environmental effects on minorities or low-income populations or communities as defined in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Environmental Justice Guidance (1998) (FS 2005c). Therefore, environmental justice was dismissed as an impact topic in this document.

1.5 DECISION TO BE MADE

This EA supports the NPS and FS decision-making processes related to the proposed action. Specifically, the NPS must decide whether to issue a right-of-way permit and the FS must decide whether to issue a Private Road Special Use Permit to Verizon Wireless. If the permits are issued, Verizon Wireless would implement the proposed action and would replace an existing radio tower with a telecommunications tower, install a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed, reconstruct NFSR #730A-2, and provide for operation and maintenance activities. If the NPS decides not to issue a right-of-way permit, the proposed wireless telecommunication facility upgrades and construction would not be completed and Verizon Wireless would have no need to upgrade NFSR #730A-2. If the FS decides not to issue a Private Road Special Use Permit, Verizon Wireless would not be able to implement the proposed construction activities at the telecommunications facility location, as access by construction vehicles would not be possible. In addition to the considerations related to the requirements of NEPA and applicable regulations, the NPS and FS must consider the natural resource management goals outlined in the documents presented in Section 1.3.

The NPS and FS also must decide if the proposed action warrants preparation of an EIS because of the potential for the proposed action to have significant environmental, social, or economic impacts on any resources examined in this EA. The findings of the EA will be documented in either a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS.

CHAPTER 2: THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

This chapter presents the alternatives considered and analyzed in detail, and alternatives considered but rejected for detailed analysis in the EA.

2.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Two alternatives are considered and analyzed in this EA—the no action alternative and the proposed action. Both alternatives are described below.

2.1.1 The No Action Alternative

The no action alternative includes not issuing one or both of the NPS and FS permits. Under this alternative, the NPS would not issue to Verizon Wireless a right-of-way permit to replace the existing radio tower and install a pre-fabricated equipment shed on NPS lands. Also, the FS would not issue to Verizon Wireless a Private Road Special Use Permit for reconstruction and future maintenance of NFSR #730A-2, located on NFS land in Sections 17 and 18, T140N, R102W, Billings County, North Dakota. If the NPS decides not to issue a right-of-way permit, the proposed wireless telecommunication facility upgrades and construction would not be completed and Verizon Wireless would have no need to upgrade NFSR #730A-2. If the FS decides not to issue a Private Road Special Use Permit, Verizon Wireless would not be able to implement the proposed construction activities at the telecommunications facility location, as access by construction vehicles would not be possible. Therefore, the proposed tower construction and road reconstruction and maintenance activities would not occur on federal lands.

Under the no action alternative, the NPS would continue to use and maintain the existing site and tower to support the agency radio repeater and other agency equipment. Public access to the site would continue to be maintained by Billings County and the FS; Billings County would maintain the road up to the existing scoria pit, and the FS would maintain the road up to the existing tower site. The NPS and FS would continue to undertake current maintenance activities for the existing site and road, respectively, in accordance with current management plans. Lastly, Verizon Wireless would more than likely seek a new location on state-owned or privately owned land for the proposed tower and facilities. Alternate tower locations have not been examined or proposed by Verizon Wireless at this time because Verizon Wireless has initially recognized and is attempting to minimize potential impacts on the region that could result from multiple tower and facility locations in close proximity to one another.

2.1.2 The Proposed Action

The proposed action is issuance of a right-of-way permit by the NPS to Verizon Wireless to replace an existing radio tower with a telecommunications tower, and to install a pre-fabricated equipment shed adjacent to an existing equipment shed in the TRNP. The replacement tower would be the same height (180 feet) and design as the existing guyed tower; would use the same type of guy wiring and anchor system as the existing tower; and would provide a location and support for collocated Verizon Wireless cellular antennas, equipment, and NPS radio antennas. Verizon Wireless requested preliminary bids from tower manufacturers that would minimize the potential visual impacts of the replacement tower and still pass structural tests for the specified equipment, given weather conditions of the region (see Appendix B). Based on the preliminary bids, the replacement tower would have a 24-inch face (measured center to center); would be a lattice structure with a solid steel frame; and would use steel diameters varying from 1.25 inches to 1.75 inches at the bottom of the tower, and 1.25 inches at the top of the tower. No lighting would be installed on the proposed tower because it would not meet the minimum specifications requiring lighting under Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations (14 CFR Part 77.13). The pre-fabricated equipment shed would encompass an area 12 feet by 30 feet. All construction and equipment

storage would be contained within the existing NPS-fenced radio tower compound (NPS 2004). Verizon Wireless would also undertake operation and maintenance activities after construction.

The proposed action also includes issuance of a Private Road Special Use Permit by the FS to Verizon Wireless to reconstruct and maintain approximately 1.6 miles of NFSR #730A-2. For most of the road, the two-track character of the existing road would be preserved with limited reconstruction, where necessary, to meet safety standards. The reconstruction of the road is designed to minimize visual impacts of the road on the adjacent NPS lands. The first mile of the road would have five specific areas that would be spot graveled and bladed because travel is difficult during periods when moisture is present. One turnout would also be constructed at the 1.2 mile point for safety reasons. Other than these actions, no other activity would occur in the first mile. The remaining 0.6 mile of the road would be bladed and graveled where needed. The steep grade located just below the electronic site would be reconstructed with a 12-foot running surface, ditching, one culvert placement, a turnout, and surfacing. Specifications of the road reconstruction are presented in Appendix B.

The proposed replacement tower would complement existing Verizon Wireless antennas on the nearby Fondue Terrace near Medora, ND, by providing increased cellular phone coverage in the region. The existing antennas on the Fondue Terrace provide cellular telephone coverage to the downtown Medora area, but provide very weak or no coverage to the interstate or several roads leading into Medora from the west and north. The proposed replacement tower would support antennas that would address areas of weaker coverage, would support continuous coverage along Interstate 94 and the roads leading to Medora, and would expand coverage in the region.

2.1.3 Comparison of Alternatives

The no action alternative provides a baseline against which to compare the proposed action. Table 2-1 compares the alternatives and presents a summary of the environmental consequences of each; the environmental consequences of these alternatives are further discussed in Chapter 4.

2.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED FROM FURTHER ANALYSIS

Verizon Wireless considered one other alternative to the proposed and no action alternative, which was to locate the telecommunication equipment (tower and pre-fabricated equipment shed) on a site other than the one proposed and considered in the EA. A specific alternative site was not identified because it was determined during the planning stage of the project that building a new tower on other public or privately owned land would generally have significant negative impacts on the scenery and viewsheds of the region, by increasing the number of towers in the region by one. Verizon Wireless determined that replacement of an existing tower, rather than building a new one in a different location, would minimize impacts on the region by maintaining the cumulative number of towers in the region while simultaneously meeting the needs to expand telecommunications service. Verizon Wireless then decided to submit an application for the necessary permits from the NPS and FS to implement the proposed action analyzed in this document and did not consider any specific, alternate locations. Therefore, any potential alternatives that would consider alternate locations are not ripe for analysis at this time.

After receipt of the application by Verizon Wireless, the NPS and FS considered including a locked gate for NFSR #730A-2 on FS lands, under the proposed action. However, the proposed action was modified and the gate was eliminated from consideration for several reasons, including: (1) gates are ineffective because topography doesn't generally offer effective gating points; (2) the FS does not want to create a precedent for installing gates on roads; (3) placing a gate on a road can sometimes draw more attention to the area (for example, during hunting season); (4) current traffic use of the road is very limited; and (5) a private citizen requires access to exercise grazing permits.

TABLE 2-1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Resource	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2: Proposed Action
Physical Resources		
Ecological Setting	Negligible long-term impacts	Negligible long-term impacts
Watershed Setting	Negligible long-term impacts	Negligible long-term impacts
Soil Resources	Negligible, site-specific, long-term impacts	Minor, site-specific, and short- and long-term impacts from soil disturbance and erosion
Water Resources	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor, short- and long-term impacts from erosion, causing sedimentation
Air Quality and Noise	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor and moderate, short-term impacts from exhaust, dust dispersion, and construction noise, as well as negligible long-term impacts
Biological Resources		
Vegetation	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor, site-specific, short- and long-term impacts from localized vegetation removal and possible spread of noxious and invasive weeds
Wildlife and Fisheries	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor, site-specific and local, short- and long-term impacts from habitat loss and temporary displacement during construction
Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species	Negligible long-term impacts	No effect on endangered species; not likely to adversely affect one threatened species (bald eagle), if construction activities would be completed during the fall and winter seasons; may affect sensitive animal and plant species because of the presence of suitable habitat (Baird's sparrow, Sprague's pipit, loggerhead shrike, Dakota skipper, tawny crescent butterfly, ottoe skipper, Torrey's cryptantha, nodding wild buckwheat, Dakota buckwheat, sand lily, scoria lily or dwarf mentzelia, alyssum-leaved phlox, alkali sacaton, and Hooker's townsendia); no effect on raptor species of concern or watch plant species.
Heritage and Cultural Resources		
Heritage and Cultural Resources	Negligible long-term impacts	Negligible long-term impacts
Social Resources		
Wilderness	Negligible long-term impacts	Negligible long-term impacts

TABLE 2-1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Resource	Alternative 1: No Action	Alternative 2: Proposed Action
Scenery Resources	Should the NPS or the FS decide not to issue the respective permits to Verizon Wireless, the company would more than likely seek alternate locations on non-federal land for the proposed telecommunications tower. If so, minor, local and regional, long-term impacts, could potentially occur.	Minor, site-specific and local, long-term impacts from a change in the equipment supported by the proposed tower, and from the proposed road reconstruction.
Transportation and Roads	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor, site-specific and local, short- and long-term impacts from road reconstruction and minor increase in traffic flow Minor, local, long-term, beneficial impacts by increasing road quality
Recreation	Negligible long-term impacts	Minor, site-specific and local, long-term impacts from enhanced access to the site and surrounding areas

CHAPTER 3: THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This chapter presents information about the natural and human-made environments potentially affected by the no action and proposed alternatives. Physical, biological, heritage and cultural, and social resources are presented, including:

- Physical resources: ecological and watershed settings, soil and water resources, and air quality (including noise)
- Biological resources: vegetation; wildlife and fisheries; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
- Heritage and cultural resources
- Social resources: wilderness, scenery resources, transportation and roads, and recreation.

3.1 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

The following describes the ecological setting, watershed setting, soil resources, water resources, and air quality of the project and cumulative effect (CE) areas. The project area is comprised of the road corridor and existing, fenced tower site; is located primarily along a ridgeline between two drainages (subwatersheds); and was determined by sight lines. The CE area encompasses lands below the road and which may provide flow paths to streams. Figure 2 presents the CE area.

3.1.1 Ecological Setting

TRNP and the DPG are within the Northwestern Great Plains Section (331F) of the National Hierarchical Framework of Ecological Units (FS 1994). The Northwestern Great Plains Section description includes the following:

- Gently sloping to rolling, moderately dissected shale plains and eroded escarpments characterize the landscape (see Appendix C).
- Sedimentary non-marine rocks of Paleocene and Lower Tertiary origin occur.
- Soils range from shallow to deep and generally have loamy to clayey textures.
- Natural prairie vegetation includes western wheat grass (*Agropyron smithii*), green needle grass (*Stipa viridula*), blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), needle-and-thread (*Stipa comata*), and buffalo current (*Ribes odoratum*). Bluebunch wheat grass (*Agropyron spicatum*), little bluestem (*Andropogon scoparius*), and sideoats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*) occur on shallow soils.
- Streams include dendritic first order channels that are tributary to long second and third order streams that flow briefly following storms or seasonally.
- Climate of western North Dakota is typically semi-arid and continental, characterized by long, cold winters and short, warm summers.

2005-08-04 \\nmfile\shared\projects\river\zom\hdd_rough_rider\map\fig\ea_figure_2.mxd THEM-MN kim.gorman




FIGURE 2 - CUMULATIVE EFFECTS AREA BOUNDARY

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
REPLACEMENT OF A COMMUNICATIONS TOWER IN THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK
AND U.S. FOREST SERVICE ACCESS ROAD IMPROVEMENT**

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| | Proposed 180' Guyed Tower | | Intermittent Stream |
| | Proposed Improved Road | | Perennial Stream/River |
| | Existing Fenced Compound | | National Forest Land |
| | Cumulative Effects Boundary for Physical Resources | | National Park Service Land |
| | | | Travel Route |

0 0.25 0.5 1
Miles

Prepared by Tetra Tech EM Inc.
Created using ArcMap 9.0
GCS North_American 1927 Albers



Table 3-1 provides climate data for Medora, North Dakota, and Table 3-2 presents climate data for Mott, North Dakota. The climate data for Mott is presented because it was used in the erosion model, as it was the best available data in the model for the closest location to the project area. Precipitation and temperatures for Mott and Medora are within 4 and 7 percent of each other, respectively. These differences are small enough to not affect the relative accuracy of the erosion predictions. Additional information regarding the ecological setting is available in the Watershed Report in the Project File (Tetra Tech 2005b).

**TABLE 3-1
CLIMATE DATA FOR
MEDORA, NORTH DAKOTA**

Month	Average High Temperature (Degrees Fahrenheit)	Average Low Temperature (Degrees Fahrenheit)	Mean Precipitation (inches)
January	27.0	1.7	0.39
February	34.0	9.4	0.36
March	43.5	17.6	0.62
April	58.3	29.1	1.43
May	70.8	40.5	2.27
June	79.5	49.8	3.36
July	87.1	54.5	2.05
August	86.7	52.4	1.42
September	74.6	41.1	1.40
October	62.4	30.3	0.86
November	42.9	17.5	0.48
December	31.5	6.6	0.45
Annual			15.09

Reference: NPS. Undated. Monthly Climate Data for Medora, North Dakota, since 1949. Theodore Roosevelt National Park.

3.1.2 Watershed Setting

The project area is located within the Lower Knutson Creek and the Lower Andrews Creek sub-watersheds of the Little Missouri River. A Maintenance Level 2, two-track road (NFSR #730A-2), leading to the existing tower site, is located on the ridge dividing the two sub-watersheds. Therefore, portions of both watersheds are included in the project area, and the physical CE area extends down drainages within both watersheds. Almost 90 percent of NFSR #730A-2 is within the Lower Knutson Creek watershed, while the remaining portion is in the Lower Andrews Creek watershed. The CE boundary is presented in Figure 2 and characterized in Table 2 of the Watershed Report in the Project File (Tetra Tech 2005b). The NPS or the FS manage all lands within the CE area. The CE area has approximately 1 mile of roads and mapped streams per square mile (depicted on U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] 1:24,000 topographic quadrangle maps). Additional un-mapped streams occur in the CE area. Rangeland is the dominant land use within the CE area (NPS 1998).

**TABLE 3-2
CLIMATE DATA FOR
MOTT, NORTH DAKOTA**

Month	Mean Maximum Temperature (Degrees Fahrenheit)	Mean Minimum Temperature (Degrees Fahrenheit)	Mean Precipitation (inches)	Number of wet days
January	24.1	1.3	0.34	3.8
February	30.6	8.2	0.34	3.8
March	39.6	16.7	0.67	4.8
April	55.2	28.9	1.63	7.1
May	67.5	40.6	2.56	8.5
June	76.4	50.2	3.5	10
July	83.8	55.1	1.99	7.7
August	83	53	1.71	6.8
September	71.7	41.7	1.33	5.8
October	59.9	30.6	0.78	3.9
November	41.3	17.3	0.46	3.5
December	29.3	6.9	0.34	3.8
Annual			15.66	69.5

Reference: FS. Undated. Climate data for Mott RR, ND. On-line at: <http://forest.moscowsl.wsu.edu/cgi-bin/fswepp/rc/copypar.pl>. Accessed May 2005.

3.1.3 Soil Resources

The soil map units of the CE area are described and displayed in the Watershed Report in the Project File (Tetra Tech 2005b). The soils are silt loams or loams with 0- to 8-percent rock fragments. Generally, water table depth exceeds 6 feet (USDA – National Soil Information System [NASIS] 1995). The soils are well drained with moderate permeability. The primary soil component in the project area is Badland, generally characterized as having a soil surface texture of unweathered bedrock (Tetra Tech 2004). According to the Billings County soil survey for Section 27, the project area consists of Littlemo-Chanta Complex (Littlemo silt and Chanta loam) with 0- to 3-percent slopes (USDA North Dakota Natural Resource Conservation Service 1944).

3.1.4 Water Resources

Streams and lakes in North Dakota are classified according to Chapter 33-16-02.1 Standards of Quality for Waters of the State (ND Department of Health [ND DoH] 1999). The Little Missouri River is classified as a Class II stream and eligible for designation as a Wild and Scenic River. Lower Knutson Creek and Lower Andrews Creek are not specifically designated in the state standard and therefore have received a Class III stream designation. The standard for Class III streams is:

“...waters shall be suitable for industrial and agricultural uses, i.e., cooling, washing, irrigation, and stock watering. These streams all have low average flows, and generally, prolonged periods of no flow and are of marginal or seasonal value for immersion recreation and fish aquatic biota. The quality of the water must be maintained to protect recreation, fish, and aquatic biota.” (ND DoH 1999).

The nearest mapped stream is approximately 840 feet northwest of NFSR #730A-2, and no mapped streams cross the project area. Within the CE area, the smallest streams flow after storm events, while larger streams flow seasonally. No streams located within the CE area flow throughout the year.

Several small U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) mapped wetlands are located within the CE area (USFWS 2005). They are located greater than 840 feet from the existing road corridor and tower facility, and therefore wetlands would not be expected to be directly, indirectly, or cumulatively impacted by the proposed action. Evidence of wetlands was not observed near the existing road corridor or tower facility during the site reconnaissance of May 2005.

3.1.5 Air Quality and Noise

The Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1977 (as amended) established six principle pollutants that act as indicators of air quality in the United States: ozone, particulate matter, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and lead. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) were established for each of these criteria pollutants. The NAAQS are the concentrations of these principle pollutants above which adverse effects on human health may occur. Geographic areas where air pollution levels consistently stay below the NAAQS are designated “attainment” areas. Geographic areas where air pollution levels persistently exceed the NAAQS are designated “nonattainment” areas. A geographic area at one time designated as a nonattainment area but now in attainment (with a maintenance plan approved by the EPA) is designated a “maintenance” area.

Air quality in and around TRNP is generally excellent and the area is in attainment of the NAAQS. Under the CAA, the park is designated a federal Class I airshed, which requires the highest level of air quality protection under the Act. Class I areas include national parks over 6,000 acres that were in existence in 1977 at the time the Clean Air Act was passed. That act established a national goal of preventing any future, and remedying any existing, human-made visibility impairment in Class I areas. Historically, wildfires, blowing dust, and burning coal seams have had minor, transient impacts on air quality in the region. In recent decades, energy development, including oil, gas, coal, and coal fired electricity generation in North Dakota and surrounding states, has impacted air quality in the area.

Although noise levels in and around the park have increased in recent years (due to a variety of reasons, including increases in development and industrial operations), the ambient noise levels within the project area are low, based on observations of NPS and FS personnel. Natural sounds are dominant in the project area, with other noise occasionally occurring at infrequent or low levels, or at some distance from the project area (the nearest residences are located approximately 1 mile from the proposed site).

3.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following describes the vegetation; wildlife and fisheries; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species of the project and CE areas. For the purposes of assessing biological resources, the project area as previously defined was expanded to include a 250-foot corridor of the existing road (125 feet off the centerline); a biological survey was conducted within the expanded project area.

3.2.1 Vegetation

Two geographic areas are located on the Little Missouri National Grassland. They are the Badlands Geographic Area and Rolling Prairie Geographic Area. The diverse landscapes of the Badlands and Rolling Prairie Geographic Areas support a variety of vegetation types. Vegetation corresponds with the abrupt changes in edaphic and hydric conditions. Site characteristics that include soil texture, soil

chemistry, slope, exposure, and degree of erosion dictate plant habitats (Earthworks Archaeology & Environmental Investigative Services [Earthworks] 2005).

The general area is predominately native grasslands with wooded draws in low drainages and on protected slopes of drainages and hills. The tower site occurs on a nearly level, somewhat convex, upland plateau. The site is fenced and appears to be mowed regularly. The needle-and-thread/ threadleaf sedge (*Carex filifolia*) habitat type is predominant. No shrubs or trees occur on the site. A patch of smooth brome (*Bromus inermis*) occurs on the west fence line, and approximately 50 leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*) plants occur in a 20-square-foot area in the southwest corner of the fenced area. Areas outside of the fence line are grazed and similar to vegetation along the route (Earthworks 2005).

The proposed disturbance area follows NFSR #730A-2 to an existing cellular tower pad site. NFSR #730A-2 is an older, Maintenance Level 2, two-track road that winds through the hills. Introduced grasses and weed species are common over the length of the route. The east end of the route is a level plateau area that is grazed rather low. According to the biological assessment/evaluation conducted for the project area, the needle-and-thread/threadleaf sedge habitat type is dominant. The amount of needle-and-thread has been reduced by grazing pressure. Patches of leafy spurge occur, especially associated with silver sagebrush. The north side of NFSR #730A-2 has a large area of downy brome (*Bromus tectorum*). Much of the route occurs along the shoulder or summits of hills. As a result, the route dissects the uphill ends of green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) draws that occur perpendicular to the route. Smooth brome and leafy spurge are common in the upper slopes of the wooded areas. Weedy species are common along barren portions of the two-track road, including sweetclover (*Melilotus* spp.), field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*), crested wheatgrass (*Agropyron cristatum*), and downy brome. Clay habitat occurs along the route with inclusions of the big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) habitat type. Hill slopes adjacent to NFSR #730A-2 often are dominated by the little bluestem (*Andropogon scoparius*) habitat type, which is heavily grazed. A large scoria pit occurs on the north side of the route and smaller one on the south side. At the west end, a green ash draw parallels the route. Smooth brome and bluegrass (*Poa* spp) are dominant in the understory with scattered plants of leafy spurge. Introduced grasses are more common along NFSR #730A-2 as it nears West River Road. A complete list of plant species occurring in the proposed project area is included in the biological assessment/evaluation in the Project File (Earthworks 2005).

3.2.2 Wildlife and Fisheries

There are 281 species of terrestrial and 32 species of aquatic vertebrate wildlife recorded within the region (NPS 1994). Bison (*Bison bison*), California bighorn (*Ovis Canadensis californiana*), pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*), and elk (*Cervus elephus*) have been recorded in and around the project area, and in the region. A variety of smaller mammals, including the northern pocket gopher (*Thomomys talpoides*), voles (various species), and mice (various species) commonly use the project area, as do porcupine (*Erethizon dorsatum*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), white-tailed deer (*Odocoideus virginianus*), feral horses (*Equus caballus*), and coyote (*Canis latrans*) (NPS 1994). However, the fenced portion of the project area (containing the existing tower and equipment shed) usually excludes larger species of terrestrial wildlife from that portion of the project area.

There are 186 observed avian species, with an additional 22 suspected. Sixty-eight species are known to breed in the region and 39 other are considered probable. Common birds include the northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), sharp-tailed grouse (*Tympanuchus phasianellus*), black-billed magpie (*Pica pica*), western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*), several species of sparrow, and many other common avian species (NPS 1994).

Little information is available on the distribution and abundance of the seven identified amphibians and the 12 reptile species within the region. Most species occurring in the region, and potentially in the project area, are widely distributed. Reptile species known to be present include the following: western plains garter snake (*Thamnophis radix*), plains hognosed snake (*Heterodon nasicus*), yellow-bellied racer (*Coluber constrictor*), bullsnake (*Pituophis catenifer*), prairie rattlesnake (*Crotalus viridis*), and short-horned lizard (*Phrynosoma douglassi*). Resident amphibians include the Great Plains toad (*Bufo cognatus*) and the Rocky Mountain toad (*Bufo woodhousii*) (NPS 1994).

Twenty-five fish species are identified in the Little Missouri River. The European carp (*Cyprinus carpio*) is a nonnative species common in the river and is considered undesirable by the North Dakota Game and Fish Department. The silvery minnow (*Hybognathus nuchalis*) and the plains minnow (*Hybognathus placitus*) represent approximately 80 percent of the fish number in the river as a whole (NPS 1994).

3.2.3 Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species

A list of threatened and endangered species that could occur in the Little Missouri National Grassland was obtained from the USFWS, and a list of sensitive species and raptor species of concern was obtained from the FS (October 28, 2004) and the Natural Heritage Program (Earthworks 2005). The biological assessment/evaluation contains the list and description of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species (see the Project File; Earthworks 2005). The USFWS and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department (NDGF) were consulted for known and potential occurrences of species of concern in the project areas. Current information from raptor nests was obtained from the field survey (conducted May 20-21, 2005) and historical information (Earthworks 2005).

Based on the research and field survey, no federally-listed threatened or endangered (or proposed) plant species occur in this area, although sensitive plant species do occur. Threatened, endangered, and sensitive wildlife species could potentially occur in the area due to migration; there is no critical habitat to threatened, endangered, or sensitive species in the project area, nor do any species breed in the project area. Table 3-3 presents species of concern in the region that potentially occur in the project area (including sensitive plant species occurring in the project area; watch plant species that could occur in the project area in the future; and wildlife species that could potentially migrate into the project area).

3.3 HERITAGE AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

On February 3, 2005, Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc., conducted a file search of the State Historical Society of North Dakota's site and manuscript files for the project area and a 1-mile radius surrounding the area. The search revealed that 14 previous inventories had been conducted near the project area. These included inventories completed for oil and gas development, communication towers, a recreational bicycle path, and road expansion, none of which crossed the current proposed construction corridor. The previous inventories revealed three prehistoric isolates, three prehistoric sites, and six historic sites, as shown in Table 3-4.

The project area was clearly defined and was surveyed using zig-zag pedestrian transects spaced 10-15 meters apart. The proposed cellular tower location had sparse short grass prairie vegetation providing 50-percent ground surface visibility, with patches of eroded areas providing nearly 80-percent visibility. The sloping areas had sage, yucca, cactus, and other forbs, with little grass cover. The soils in the area consisted of sandy silty loam with numerous gravels overlaying a clay base. The access road was also in short grass prairie, although very sparse in most areas, providing 50- to 80-percent ground surface visibility. Numerous cutbanks, erosional scarps, rodent burrow back dirt piles, and road cuts existed throughout the access road corridor, providing excellent subsurface visibility. Exposed scoria beds, shale, and sandstone outcrops also characterized the entire area with little soil deposition in these areas. No

nearby water source was observed, although the Little Missouri River is approximately 1.5 miles to the east (Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc. 2005).

TABLE 3-3
SPECIES OF CONCERN IN THE REGION AND POTENTIALLY OCCURRING IN THE PROJECT AREA

Endangered Wildlife Species	
Whooping crane (<i>Grus americana</i>)	Black-footed ferret (<i>Mustela nigripes</i>)
Threatened Wildlife Species	
Bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>)	
Sensitive Bird Species	
Baird's sparrow (<i>Ammodramus bairdii</i>)	Loggerhead shrike (<i>Lanius ludovicianus</i>)
Burrowing owl (<i>Athene cunicularia</i>)	Long-billed curlew (<i>Numenius americanus</i>)
Sprague's pipit (<i>Anthus spragueii</i>)	Peregrine falcon (<i>Falco peregrinus</i>)
Greater sage grouse (<i>Centrocercus urophasianus</i>)	
Sensitive Mammal Species	
Black-tailed prairie dog (<i>Cynomys ludovicianus</i>)	CA Bighorn sheep (<i>Ovis Canadensis californiana</i>)
Sensitive Insect Species	
Dakota skipper (<i>Hesperia dacotae</i>)	Ottoe skipper (<i>Hesperia ottoe</i>)
Tawny crescent butterfly (<i>Phyciodes batessi</i>)	Regal fritillary butterfly (<i>Speyeria idalia</i>)
Sensitive Fish Species	
Northern redbelly dace (<i>Phoxinus eos</i>)	Sturgeon chub (<i>Macrhybopsis gelida</i>)
Raptor Species of Concern	
Ferruginous hawk (<i>Buteo regalis</i>)	Golden eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>)
Prairie falcon (<i>Falco mexicanus</i>)	Merlin (<i>Falco columbarius</i>)
Sensitive Plant Species	
Slimleaf goosefoot (<i>Chenopodium subglabrum</i>)	Scoria lily or Dwarf Mentzelia (<i>Mentzelia pumila</i>)
Blue lip's (<i>Collinsia parviflora</i>)	Alyssum-leaved phlox (<i>Phlox alyssifolia</i>)
Torrey's cryptantha (<i>Cryptantha torreyana</i>)	Lance-leaf (Rydberg's) cottonwood (<i>Populus x acuminata</i>)
Nodding wild buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum cernuum</i>)	Alkali sacaton (<i>Sporobolus airoides</i>)
Dakota buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum visheri</i>)	Hooker's townsendia (<i>Townsendia hookeri</i>)
Sand lily (<i>Leucocrinum montanum</i>)	
Watch Plant Species	
Spike bentgrass (<i>Agrostis exarata</i>)	Sedge mousetail (<i>Myosurus aristatus</i>)
Indian milkvetch (<i>Astragalus aboriginum</i>)	Cutleaf evening primrose (<i>Oenothera lacinata</i>)
Drummond's milkvetch (<i>Astragalus drummondii</i>)	Yellow broomrape (<i>Orobanche multiflora</i>)
Bent-flowered milkvetch (<i>Astragalus vexilliflexius</i>)	White locoweed (<i>Oxytropis sericea</i>)
Smooth spike primrose (<i>Boisduvalia glabella</i>)	Water-thread pondweed (<i>Potamogeton diversifolius</i>)
Mountain brome (<i>Bromus carinatus</i>)	Diverse leaf cinquefoil (<i>Potentilla diversifolius</i>)
Silvertop sedge (<i>Carex foenea</i>)	Three-toothed cinquefoil (<i>Potentilla tridentate</i>)
Canadian single-spike sedge (<i>Carex scirpiformis</i>)	Heartleaf buttercup (<i>Ranunculus cardiophyllus</i>)
Matted purple virgin's bower (<i>Clematis tenuiloba</i>)	Persistent yellow cress (<i>Rorippa calycina</i>)
Spreading fleabane (<i>Erigeron divergens</i>)	Green briar (<i>Smilax ecirrhata</i>)
Tap-rooted fleabane (<i>Erigeron radicans</i>)	Prairie fameflower (<i>Talinum parviflorum</i>)
Yellow bell (<i>Fritillaria pudica</i>)	

Reference: Earthworks 2005.

TABLE 3-4
RESULTS OF HISTORICAL RECORD SEARCH AND PREVIOUS INVENTORIES

Site Number (SITS #)	Site Type and Description	Recorder, Date	Survey Code Number (MS #)
No Sites			3421, 8139
32BIx61	Prehistoric – Chipped Stone	Morrison, 2001	3439, 3749, 8139
32BIx193	Prehistoric – Chipped Stone	No Name, 1984	
No Sites			3749
32BI584	Historic – Sandstone Boulder with Historic Incised Script	Dowdy, 1987 Wermers, 2002	2552, 3749, 4302, 4705, 5578, 5579, 7677
32BI622	Historic – Well Built in 1960s by the National Park Service	Blikre, 1988	
32BI630	Historic – Dugout Depression	Blikre, 1988	
32BI674	Prehistoric – Cultural Material Scatter	Foster, 1988	
32BI721	Historic – Sheet Metal Fronts to Dugouts	Blikre, 1988	
32BI722	Historic – CCC Sandstone Mining Area	Blikre, 1988	
32BI723	Prehistoric – Cultural Material Scatter	Blikre, 1988	
32BI724	Historic – Possible CCC Camp	Blikre, 1988	
32BI729	Prehistoric – Cultural Material Scatter	Blikre, 1988	
23BIx62	Prehistoric – Chipped Stone	Morrison, 2001	3267, 3749, 8139
No Sites			3267, 3421, 3914, 7580, 7962, 8139

Source: Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc., May 2005.

Notes:

CCC Civilian Conservation Corps

SITS # Site Number

MS # Survey Code Number

One isolated find, 32BIx81, consisting of two chalcedony flakes, was located during the survey. The flakes were found within two meters of the existing two-track road, in an exposed gravel lense. No other cultural material was located, and the flakes are likely from minor prehistoric material testing. The lack of deposition in the area and the excellent surface visibility suggest that finding other cultural materials in this area is very unlikely. Therefore, a finding of *No Historic Properties Affected* was recommended for the project area as surveyed and mapped (Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc. 2005). The FS Principal Investigator/Archeologist and State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) both agreed with this assessment (FS 2005a, State Historical Society of North Dakota 2005).

3.4 SOCIAL RESOURCES

The following describes the wilderness, scenery resources, transportation and roads, and recreation resources of the project and CE areas.

3.4.1 Wilderness

Approximately 42 percent of TRNP has been designated as wilderness under Public Law 95-625 (92 Stat. 3490), including 19,410 acres in the north unit and 10,510 acres in the south unit. These wilderness areas are managed as undeveloped backcountry and as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. The undeveloped areas provide excellent opportunities for hiking, horseback riding, exploring, and for

experiencing the environment much the way Theodore Roosevelt experienced it during his lifetime. TRNP manages these areas by providing regular protection patrolling, maintenance of foot and horseback trails, and monitoring of day and overnight visitation. The current tower and facility can be seen from the wilderness area boundary just north of the project area (see the photograph simulations presented in Appendix D).

3.4.2 Scenery Resources

Visitors come to TRNP primarily to see the beauty of the North Dakota badlands and prairie scenery, and to observe the wildlife. In the 1994 Resource Management Plan, the park identified 28 scenic views that are part of the park experience and worthy of protection, but which extend beyond the park boundaries. Fifteen of these view points are located in the South Unit, 12 are in the North Unit, and one is located at the Elkhorn Unit. Lands bordering the south unit of the park are about equally divided between private and public ownership. The FS administers many of the surrounding public lands. Historically, this land has been used for livestock grazing, recreation, and mineral development in the badlands, and grain farming on the upland plains. Oil and gas development first occurred on the DPG in 1950 but saw its most dramatic growth during the later 1970s and early 1980s oil boom. There are 38 active oil and gas wells located within a mile of the south unit of the park. Two thirds of these wells are located on private property and the remainder on federal or state lands. Recent demand for oil and gas has resulted in some increase in drilling near the park.

Noise, odor pollution, and vista intrusion have multiplied in the last decades and directly affect and distract from the park's aesthetic values. These environmental impacts are caused by various structures and conditions such as batteries of large tanks, new high standard roads, high profile powerlines, hydrogen sulfide gas, flaring wells, smoke, dust, pump engines, and cellular telecommunication towers.

The proposed site currently supports a communications tower and adjacent equipment shed (see Appendix D). The current tower can be seen from the town of Medora and from the wilderness area north of the site.

The FS uses evaluations of Scenic Integrity to guide planning and management of scenic resources. Scenic Integrity refers to the state of naturalness or, conversely, the state of disturbance created by human activities or alternation. Integrity is stated in degrees of deviation from the existing landscape character in a national grassland or forest (FS 2001a). The Scenic Integrity Objective for the project area is High (Appears Unaltered), which refers to landscapes where the valued landscape character appears intact. Deviations may be present but must repeat the form, line, color, texture, and pattern common to the landscape character so completely and at such scale that they are not evident (FS 2001a). NFSR #730A-2 currently meets the Scenic Integrity Objective of High for the project area.

3.4.3 Transportation and Roads

NFSRs are maintained to varying standards depending on the level of use and management objectives. Most of the roads are Maintenance Level 2, followed by Levels 3 and 4. Maintenance levels are described below (FS 2005b).

Road Maintenance Level Definitions

Maintenance Level 1: Assigned to intermittent service roads during the time they are closed to vehicular traffic. The closure period is one year or longer. Basic custodial maintenance is performed.

- Maintenance Level 2:* Assigned to roads open for use by high-clearance vehicles. Passenger car traffic is not a consideration.
- Maintenance Level 3:* Assigned to roads open and maintained for travel by a prudent driver in a standard passenger car. User comfort and convenience are not considered priorities.
- Maintenance Level 4:* Assigned to roads that provide a moderate degree of user comfort and convenience at moderate travel speeds.
- Maintenance Level 5:* Assigned to roads that provide a high degree of user comfort and convenience. Normally, roads are double-laned and paved or aggregate-surfaced with dust abatement.

The existing road is a Maintenance Level 2, two-track road, portions of which are accessible by four-wheel drive vehicles. Portions of the road near the tower site are not currently passable. No data exist on the current level of use of the road; however, the FS estimates that current use level is extremely low.

3.4.4 Recreation

Between 2002 and 2004, TRNP has recorded an annual average of 485,389 visitors to all areas of the park, including the Medora Entrance, Painted Canyon, North Unit, walk-in, and non-recreational (NPS 2005). The principle activity of visitors to the park is sightseeing by motor vehicle (NPS 1987). Many opportunities exist for dispersed recreation activities such as camping, backcountry camping, hiking, interpretive programs, and viewing wildlife and scenery. Many vistas are maintained, such as the Painted Canyon facilities, which offer visitors scenic views of unique ecosystems and scenery. Hunting is not permitted in the park, although limited fishing is permitted. Hunting and fishing are popular recreation activities in the region, however, on lands outside of park boundaries.

Recreation use on National Forest System lands in or near the project area is primarily of a dispersed nature. The Buffalo Gap trail, located approximately 1.5 miles west of the project area, is heavily used by mountain bikers, horse users, and to a lesser degree, hikers. Big game hunters use the project area in late summer and fall. The area is occasionally used for picnics or other social gatherings.

CHAPTER 4: ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter of the EA forms the scientific and analytic basis for comparisons of alternatives as required by 40 CFR 1502.14. This discussion of impacts (effects) is organized in parallel with Chapter 3 (The Affected Environment) and is organized by impact topic (or resource area), as follows:

- Physical resources: ecological and watershed settings, soil and water resources, and air quality (including noise)
- Biological resources: vegetation; wildlife and fisheries; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species
- Heritage and cultural resources
- Social resources: wilderness, scenery resources, transportation and roads, and recreation.

The no action alternative and the proposed action are discussed within each resource area. To the extent possible, the direct, indirect, short-term, long-term, beneficial, and adverse impacts of each alternative are described for each resource area. Cumulative impacts are discussed in the context of the definition given in 40 CFR 1508.7.

Intensity, Duration, and Type of Impact — Evaluation of alternatives takes into account intensity, duration, and types of impacts on the resources in the project area and region. Intensity of impacts is generally defined as being negligible, minor, moderate, or major (with negligible meaning no change, minor being barely detectable, moderate being clearly detectable, and major being a substantial alteration of current conditions). Duration of impacts is evaluated based on the short-term or long-term nature of alternative-associated changes on existing conditions. Type of impact refers to the beneficial or adverse consequences of implementing a given alternative. Methodologies were identified to define the change in resources that would occur with implementation of the alternatives. Thresholds were established for each impact topic to help understand the severity and magnitude of changes in resource conditions, both adverse and beneficial, of the various management alternatives. More exact interpretations and definitions of intensity, duration, and type of impact are presented for each resource area examined in the following sections. However, since the full engineering design of the proposed tower and facility has not been completed, analysis is largely qualitative. Professional judgment is used to reach reasonable conclusions as to the intensity and duration of potential impacts.

Cumulative Impacts — The CEQ regulations, which implement NEPA, require assessment of cumulative impacts in the decision-making process for federal projects. Cumulative impacts are defined as, “the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or nonfederal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.” (40 CFR 1508.7).

Cumulative impacts are considered for both the no action and proposed action alternatives. Cumulative impacts were determined by combining the impacts of action alternatives with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Therefore, it was necessary to identify other ongoing or foreseeable future projects within TRNP and DPG and, if necessary, the surrounding region. Other actions and plans that were considered during the analysis of cumulative impacts were presented in Section 1.3, Relationship to Other Environmental and Planning Documents.

Impairment Analyses — NPS regulations and guidance require an analysis of potential effects to determine whether or not actions would impair park resources. The fundamental purpose of the national park system, as established by the Organic Act and reaffirmed by the General Authorities Act, as amended, begins with a mandate to conserve park resources and values. NPS managers must always seek ways to avoid, or to minimize to the greatest degree practicable, adversely impacting park resources and values. However, the laws do give the NPS the management discretion to allow impacts on park resources and values when necessary and appropriate to fulfill the purposes of a park, as long as the impact does not constitute impairment of the affected resources and values. Although Congress has given the NPS the management discretion to allow certain impacts within a park system unit, that discretion is limited by the statutory requirement that the agency must leave park resources and values unimpaired, unless a particular law directly and specifically provides otherwise. The prohibited impairment is an impact that, in the professional judgment of the responsible NPS manager, would harm the integrity of park resources or values.

An impact on any park resource or value may constitute an impairment, but an impact would be more likely to constitute an impairment to the extent that it has a major or severe adverse effect upon a resource or value whose conservation is:

- Necessary to fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or proclamation of the park
- Key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park
- Identified as a goal in the park's general management plan or other relevant NPS planning documents.

Impairment may result from NPS activities in managing the park; visitor activities; or activities undertaken by concessionaires, contractors, and others operating in the park.

The following process was used to determine whether the alternatives had the potential to impair park resources and values:

1. The park's enabling legislation, the General Management Plan, the Strategic Plan, and other relevant background were reviewed with regard to the unit's purpose and significance, resource values, and resource management goals or desired future conditions.
2. Management objectives specific to resource protection goals at the park were identified.
3. Thresholds were established for each resource of concern to determine the context, intensity, and duration of impacts, as defined above.
4. An analysis was conducted to determine if the magnitude of impact reached the level of "impairment," as defined by NPS Management Policies.

The impact analysis includes any findings of impairment to park resources and values for each of the management alternatives.

4.1 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

This section provides information regarding potential impacts on the ecological and watershed settings, soil resources, water resources, and air quality of the TRNP and DPG area.

4.1.1 Ecological Setting

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on the ecological setting (macro-environment), including topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — No change on regional topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate. The action would not affect the existing natural environment because any change would be too small or localized to exert a measurable or perceptible effect on the natural system function.
- Minor — Very limited change on regional topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate. The action would affect the existing natural environment, but its measurement would require considerable scientific effort, it would be very localized in area, and its effect on the natural system function would be barely perceptible.
- Moderate — Disturbance on regional topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate. The action would cause measurable effects on a large area of the natural environment, and natural system functions could deviate from normal levels under existing conditions.
- Major — Severe disturbance on regional topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate. The action would have drastic consequences on the existing natural environment. The change would be readily apparent in the region. Natural system functions would be permanently altered from normal levels under existing conditions.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - Long-Term — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact the ecological setting.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the ecological setting of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the ecological setting of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would leave the project area unchanged in terms of topography, underlying bedrock, soil types, regional hydrology, and regional climate.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project or CE areas that would impact the ecological setting.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have negligible long-term impacts on the ecological setting of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the ecological setting of the project or CE areas.

4.1.2 Watershed Setting

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on the watershed setting, including the designation of watersheds and sub-watersheds (as defined by regional topography) and potential changes in land use. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — No change to designation of watersheds and sub-watersheds, or to land use.
- Minor — Very limited change to designation of watersheds and sub-watersheds, or to land use.
- Moderate — Disturbance on a watershed scale, changes to designation of watersheds and sub-watersheds, or changes to land use.
- Major — Severe disturbance on a watershed scale, severe changes to designation of watersheds and sub-watershed, or severe changes to land use.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - Long-Term — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of designation of watersheds or sub-watersheds, and land use. No disturbance on a watershed scale would result from the no action alternative.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact the watershed setting.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the watershed setting of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the watershed setting of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would leave the project area unchanged in terms of designation of watersheds or sub-watersheds, and land use. No disturbance on a watershed scale would result from the proposed action.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact the watershed setting.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have negligible long-term impacts on the watershed setting of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the watershed setting of the project or CE areas.

4.1.3 Soil Resources

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on soil resources, including the effects and interaction of existing soil conditions in the project and CE areas, groundwater depth, drainage, erosion potential, and slope. Impacts of construction activities as well as subsequent operations of the proposed facilities are discussed based on the soil types present in the project area. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- **Negligible** — No change in drainage capacity or moisture absorbency of existing soils, or in erosion potential during or after construction; no potential changes to groundwater quality or flow. Soils would not be affected, or the effects on soils would be below or at the lower levels of detection. Any effects on soil productivity or fertility would be slight, and no long-term effects on soils would occur.
- **Minor** — Very limited soil disturbance (involving an area less than 5 acres) having some possible short-term and localized effects related to increased erosion potential, but no long-term changes in soil drainage capacity, moisture absorbency, or groundwater resources. The effects on soils would be detectable. Effects on soil productivity or fertility would be small. If mitigation is needed to offset adverse effects, it would be relatively simple to implement and would likely be successful.
- **Moderate** — Disturbance of 5 acres or more of soil requiring an erosion control plan with mitigation to address measurable, long-term changes in soil drainage and moisture absorbency characteristics, and possible small-scale indirect impacts on groundwater resources. The effect on soil productivity or fertility would be readily apparent, likely long-term, and result in a change to the soil character over a relatively wide area. Mitigation measures would probably be necessary to offset adverse effects and would likely be successful.
- **Major** — Disturbance of 5 acres or more of soil requiring an erosion control plan with mitigation to address measurable, long-term changes in soil drainage and moisture absorbency characteristics, and direct and indirect impacts on local groundwater flow and/or quality. The effect on soil productivity or fertility would be readily apparent and long-term; the character of the soils over a large area would change substantially. Mitigation measures to offset adverse effects would be needed; they would be extensive with success not guaranteed.
- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

The FS Internet-based interface to the Water Erosion Prediction Project (FSWEPP) model was used to predict erosion from the roadbed. “Road WEPP” was used to predict soil erosion for the construction phase and the future road condition (Elliot, Hall, and Scheele 2000). “Disturbed WEPP” was used to estimate the amount of soil erosion from the tower site (Elliot, Hall, and Scheele 2000). The FSWEPP

model provided an approximation of erosion and sedimentation. “At best, any predicted runoff or erosion value, by any model, would be within only plus or minus 50 percent of the true value. Erosion rates are highly variable, and most models can predict only a single value” (Elliot, Hall, and Scheele 2000). Replicated research has shown that observed values vary widely for identical plots, or the same plot from year to year (Elliot, Page-Dumroese, and Robichaud 1996).

No Action Alternative

Analysis — Direct and indirect effects of the no action alternative would be soil disturbance and erosion. Dakota Prairie Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan standards and guidelines (S&G) for soil resources must be followed regardless of which alternative is selected for implementation. The S&Gs for soil resources are summarized in Table 4-1.

The predicted erosion rate for the tower site in its current condition is 1.3 tons/acre/yr. Soil would be expected to erode at the same rate in the future. No change in drainage capacity or moisture absorbency of existing soils, or changes to groundwater quality or flow, would be expected from implementation of the no action alternative.

TABLE 4-1
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR SOIL RESOURCES

Guidelines	Keep ground disturbances to a minimum when constructing roads and other facilities. Ensure road length and road width fit the purpose of construction and are compatible with local topography.
	Prohibit soil disturbing activities (e.g., road construction, well pad construction) on slopes greater than 40 percent and on soils susceptible to mass failure, unless the alternative causes more environmental damage.
Standards	Stabilize and maintain roads and other facilities' sites during and after construction to minimize erosion.
	Reclaim roads and other disturbed sites when use ends to prevent resource damage. Restoring stable grades, stable drainage, and ground cover are critical to closing out disturbances and protecting soil productivity and stream health.
	Limit roads and other disturbed sites to the minimum feasible number, width, and total length consistent with the purpose of specific operations, local topography, and climate.
	Construct roads and other disturbed sites to minimize sediment discharge into streams, lakes, and wetlands.

Source: FS. 2001a. *Dakota Prairie Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan*. Dakota Prairie Grasslands. May.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact soil resources.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible, site-specific, long-term impacts on the soil resources of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the soil resources of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — Direct and indirect effects of the proposed action would be soil disturbance and erosion. Dakota Prairie Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan S&Gs for soil resources must be followed regardless of which alternative is selected for implementation. The S&Gs for soil resources are summarized in Table 4-1.

The area of disturbance for the roadbed is estimated to occupy approximately 3 acres, which is the same as the existing condition. FSWEPP predicts erosion rates of 1.3 tons/acre/yr for short grass prairie lands at 5-percent slope and 40-percent soil cover. Typical erosion rates for a Western watershed rangeland are between 0.1 and 1.8 tons/acre/yr (Dissmeyer 2000). A typical erosion rate for sparse grassland in Alberta is approximately 7.7 tons/acre/yr (Dunne and Leopold 1978). Thus, FSWEPP predicts erosion quantities within the range reported in the literature.

Predicted erosion rates during construction and future road use are presented in Table 4-2. Cut and fill slopes were not included in these predictions. These areas would erode because their cut and fill slopes along the road would erode at approximately background erosion rates following re-vegetation.

TABLE 4-2
ESTIMATED EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION FROM THE ROAD
RECONSTRUCTION

Phase or Condition	Predicted Erosion (tons/year)	Percent Retained within 100 feet	Percent Retained within 420 feet	Percent Retained within 840 feet
Construction Phase	29.8	65	95	99
Future Condition	8.5	54	89	97

Source: Tetra Tech. 2005a. Results of FSWEPP analysis for conditions of Replacement of a communications tower on the TRNP and Reconstruction of an access road on the DPG. Unpublished data summary. FS Administrative Record.

The predicted erosion rate for the tower site in its current condition is 1.3 tons/acre/yr. The tower location is not changing and would be expected to erode at the same rate in the future. During construction, erosion modeling indicates a potential increase of erosion to 12.8 tons/acre/yr. The predicted erosion for the future condition of the road is 3.6 tons/acre/yr. Direct effects of the proposed action and no action alternative are approximately the same and would be site-specific, long-term, and minor. The area of soil disturbance would not be substantially changed. Road reconstruction and installation of the tower would occur approximately within the footprint of the existing facilities. Indirect effects on erosion would be an expected decrease in roadbed erosion from implementing the proposed action. Gullies along the existing road would be restored and stabilized.

Erosion could be mitigated through use of Best Management Practices (BMP) that are mandatory on all construction projects disturbing more than 1 acre (NDDoH 2001). *A Guide to Temporary Erosion-Control Measures for Contractors, Designers and Inspectors* provides BMPs to reduce erosion (ND DoH 2001). Temporary Erosion-Control Measures (TECM) would reduce erosion below predicted quantities during construction phase and re-vegetation of cut and fills along the road. Erosion also could be mitigated by following the S&Gs presented in Table 4-1.

No change in drainage capacity or moisture absorbency of existing soils, or changes to groundwater quality or flow, would be expected from implementation of the proposed action.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact soil resources.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific, and short- and long-term impacts on the soil resources of the project and CE areas.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the soil resources of the project or CE areas.

4.1.4 Water Resources

Methodology — The potential impacts of the alternatives on water resources were evaluated by comparing their locations to the location of the project area. Available information on water resources of the region was reviewed to determine proximity of water resources to the project area. The nearest mapped stream is approximately 840 feet northwest of NFSR #730A-2; no mapped streams cross the existing project area; no mapped wetlands are located within the project area; and the nearest mapped wetland in the CE area is more than 840 feet away. Therefore, analyses on water resources focus on potential runoff and soil erosion that could occur after storm events, causing increased sedimentation into streams. Analyses also focus on any potential encroachment into streams and riparian areas. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- **Negligible** — Neither water quality nor hydrology would be measurably changed from current conditions. Chemical, physical, or biological changes to water quality would not be detectable and would be well below water quality standards or criteria, and would be within historical or desired water quality conditions. No measurable change would be evident in potential levels of runoff or erosion, or sedimentation into streams; no encroachment into streams and riparian areas would occur. No measurable change to riparian vegetation, habitat, or function would be detectable.
- **Minor** — Chemical, physical, or biological changes in water quality or hydrology would be measurable, would be below water quality standards or criteria, and would be within historical or desired water quality conditions. Changes would likely be small, localized, and short-term.
- **Moderate** — Chemical, physical, or biological changes in water quality or hydrology would be measurable and would be at or below water quality standards or criteria. However, historical baseline or desired water quality conditions would be altered on a short-term basis. Mitigation measures would be necessary and would be effective.
- **Major** — Chemical, physical, or biological changes in water quality or hydrology would be measurable, and water quality standards or criteria would be slightly and singularly exceeded on a short-term basis. Also, historical baseline or desired water quality conditions would be altered on a long-term basis. Mitigation measures would be necessary, with success not guaranteed.
- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

Eroded soil may be retained within filter strips that separate the soil disturbance area from surface water features. A filter strip distance of 100 feet was used to predict the amount of eroded soil that would be

retained in close proximity to the road. The filter strips were extended to 840 feet (the distance from the nearest mapped stream to NFSR #730A-2) and 420 feet (half the distance to the nearest mapped stream as an estimate of the proximity of unmapped streams to the road)—values used to obtain an approximation of the percentage of eroded soil that may become sediment in streams possibly occurring within the CE area.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — Direct and indirect effects of the no action alternative would be continued sedimentation into streams because of erosion and any potential encroachment into streams and riparian areas. Erosion would be expected to continue at current rates, and no direct encroachment would occur into stream corridors and riparian areas due to the no action alternative. The no action alternative would not affect water quality or hydrology; not cause exceedance of water quality standards and criteria; and not change any riparian vegetation, habitat, or function. Dakota Prairie Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan S&Gs for water resources must be followed regardless of which alternative is selected for implementation. The S&Gs for water resources are summarized in Table 4-3.

TABLE 4-3
STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR WATER RESOURCES

Standards	Construct roads and other disturbed sites to minimize sediment discharge into streams, lakes, and wetlands (pertains to soils).
	Allow only those actions next to perennial and intermittent streams, seeps, springs, lakes, and wetlands that maintain or improve long-term proper functioning of riparian ecosystem conditions.
	Design activities to protect and manage the riparian ecosystem. Maintain the integrity of the ecosystem, including quantity and quality of surface water and groundwater.
	Maintain and protect hydrologic regime that supplies groundwater to the wetlands so as to support species and habitats depending on the existing water table and its natural variations.
Guidelines	<p>Do not deposit waste material (silt, sand, gravel, soil, slash, debris, chemicals, or other material) below high water lines, in riparian areas, in areas immediately adjacent to riparian areas, or in natural drainageways (draws, land surface depressions, or other areas where overland flow concentrates and flows directly into streams or lakes). In addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Do not deposit foreign material or agricultural waste in natural drainageways. · Locate the lower edge of disturbed or deposited soil banks outside the active floodplain. · Prohibit stockpiling of topsoil or any other disturbed soil in the active floodplain. · Locate drilling mud pits outside of riparian areas, wetlands, and floodplains. If location is unavoidable in these areas: · Seal and dike all pits to prevent leakage. · Do not allow new roads to parallel streams when road location must occur in riparian areas except where absolutely necessary. Locate all crossings at points of low bank slope and firm surfaces.

Source: FS. 2001a. *Dakota Prairie Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan*. Dakota Prairie Grasslands. May.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact water resources.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the water resources of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the water resources of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — Direct and indirect effects of the proposed action would be sedimentation into streams because of erosion and any potential encroachment into streams and riparian areas. No direct encroachment would occur into stream corridors and riparian areas due to the proposed action. The no action alternative would not affect water quality or hydrology; not cause exceedance of water quality standards and criteria; and not change any riparian vegetation, habitat, or function. However, the proposed action would increase erosion and sedimentation into streams.

Fifty-four to 65 percent of potential soil erosion is predicted to be retained within 100 feet of the road travel surface during construction and future operations (Tetra Tech 2005a). Less than 1 percent of predicted eroded soil would likely reach mapped ephemeral streams during the construction phase and less than 5 percent would reach the assumed potential location of unmapped ephemeral streams (Table 4-2) (Tetra Tech 2005a). After construction activities, the predicted percentage of eroded soil that may reach streams is 3 percent and 11 percent for mapped and unmapped ephemeral streams, respectively.

Extrapolated predictions of unmitigated erosion quantities of sediment delivery, using the FSWEPP model, indicate an unmitigated sediment delivery to mapped streams of 0.4 and 0.3 tons per year during construction and operation of the road, respectively. Assumption is that reconstruction of the road would solve current gully erosion along the existing road and reduce erosion from the road in the future.

Extrapolated filter strip retention for the road to the tower location is less than 0.1 ton of eroded soil predicted to reach mapped ephemeral streams during construction and future management. Less than 0.2 ton per year would reach the location of mapped streams. These are predictions without mitigations and are nonetheless site-specific, long-term, and minor. Sediment delivery to streams can be reduced by following the S&Gs presented in Table 4-3, and by implementing routine road construction BMPs and implementing NDDoH TECM, as identified in the soils section.

Dakota Prairie Grassland Land and Resource Management Plan S&Gs for water resources must be followed regardless of which alternative is selected for implementation. The S&Gs for water resources are summarized in Table 4-3 (FS 2001a).

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact water resources.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, short- and long-term impacts on the water resources of the project and CE areas due to an increase in erosion and sedimentation.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the water resources of the project or CE areas.

4.1.5 Air Quality and Noise

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on the air quality and noise, including assessment for attainment with the NAAQS, air quality designations of the region, visibility impairment based on personal observations and photographs, and ambient noise levels based on personal observations. Historical and current data from air monitoring stations in the region were examined. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — No changes would occur, or changes in air quality would be below or at the level of detection, and, if detected, would have effects considered slight and short-term. No measurable change in levels of criteria pollutants under the NAAQS would occur. Noise level change would be at or below the lowest level of human perception (3 decibels or less), with no measurable consequences, either adverse or beneficial. Natural sounds would be dominant.
- Minor — Changes in air quality would be measurable, although the changes would be small and short-term with localized effects. No air quality mitigation measures would be necessary. Measurable change in levels of criteria pollutants under the NAAQS could occur, but no attainment changes would be necessary for any pollutants. Noise level change would be barely to slightly perceptible (3 to 5 decibels) but with little consequence to visitors' experience. Natural sounds would be dominant, but other noise could occasionally occur at infrequent or low levels.
- Moderate — Changes in air quality would be measurable and would have consequences, although the effects would be relatively local. Air quality mitigation measures would be necessary and the measures would likely be successful. Measurable change in levels of criteria pollutants under the NAAQS would be evident, and one attainment status change would be necessary for one criteria pollutant. Noise level change would be perceptible (5 to 10 decibels) with noticeable consequences to visitors' experience. Natural sounds would be dominant, but other noise could occasionally occur at low or moderate levels.
- Major — Changes in air quality would be measurable, would have substantial consequences, and would be noticed regionally. Air quality mitigation measures would be necessary with success not guaranteed. Measurable change in levels of criteria pollutants under the NAAQS would be evident, and more than one attainment status change would be necessary for more than one criteria pollutant. Noise level change would be readily perceptible (10 decibels or more) with substantive consequences to visitors' experience. Natural sounds would be obscured by other noise frequently or for extended periods of time.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period, or recovery within seven days or less.
 - Long-Term — Takes longer than seven days to recover, or essentially a permanent post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of attainment with the NAAQS, air quality designations of the region, visibility impairment, and ambient noise levels. Noise levels would not change and natural sounds would be dominant.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact air quality or noise.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the air quality and soundscape of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the air quality or soundscape of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed construction would cause direct site-specific, short-term, minor impacts on air quality in the areas immediately adjacent to the proposed site. During construction, exhaust and dust dispersed by construction vehicles would impact the air quality temporarily in the immediate areas of the proposed site. Those impacts would affect the site only during construction. Air quality would not be permanently degraded, and the temporary impacts would not affect the status of the region as an attainment area under the NAAQS because the impacts would affect only the immediate vicinity of each site. Visibility would not be impacted. Therefore, the impacts on air quality would not be significant.

Noise related to the proposed construction would cause direct site-specific, short-term, moderate impacts on the areas in the immediate vicinity of the proposed site. Use of construction machinery and increase in vehicle traffic at the site would cause an increase in noise to a level above the current ambient level of noise at the site. The impacts would affect the site only during construction. Heavy machinery could produce noise between 70 and 98 decibels at a distance of approximately 50 feet. However, the impacts related to noise would not be significant due to the localized and temporary status of the noise, and the fact that the nearest residences are located approximately 1 mile from the proposed site. Also, all equipment used on the site would meet applicable fire and safety codes, which include use of properly maintained mufflers.

Cumulative Impacts — Operation of the proposed wireless facility would not include any discharges of any substance into the air of the region. Maintenance of the proposed wireless telecommunication facility would have no cumulative impacts on air quality because maintenance visits would be relatively infrequent (once per month by a single vehicle). Because maintenance visits would be relatively infrequent, operation of the proposed wireless telecommunication facilities would have negligible impacts on noise levels at the proposed site. The proposed action would conform to the applicable state and federal implementation plans for attainment of air quality goals for the region.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor short-term and negligible long-term impacts on the air quality and soundscape of the project and CE areas.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the air quality or soundscape of the project or CE areas.

4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

This section provides information on the potential impacts on the vegetation; wildlife and fisheries; and threatened, endangered, and sensitive species of the TRNP and DPG area.

4.2.1 Vegetation

Methodology — Impact analyses focus on the amount of disturbance to existing terrestrial vegetation communities in the project area. Important factors include the quality of natural vegetation, the amount of site clearing necessary for implementation of the proposed action, the role of the project area in terms of unique habitat, and importance in connectivity of the ecological landscape. Potential for site restoration also is a factor in evaluation of impacts on vegetation. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — Impacts would result in no measurable or perceptible changes in plant community size, integrity, or continuity. No native terrestrial plant communities would be disturbed, and no direct or indirect impacts on native vegetation would occur.
- Minor — Impacts would be measurable or perceptible but localized within a relatively small area. The plant community's overall viability would not be affected and, if left alone, would recover.
- Moderate — Impacts would cause a change in the plant community (for example, abundance, distribution, quantity, or quality); however, the impact would remain localized.
- Major — Impacts on the plant community would be substantial, highly noticeable, and permanent.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Complete disturbance recovery in less than three years.
 - Long-Term — Disturbance recovery requiring more than three years to return to pre-disturbance levels.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of the quality of natural vegetation; unique habitat; connectivity of the ecological landscape; and plant community size, integrity, and continuity.

Cumulative Impacts — No reasonably foreseeable future projects are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact vegetation. However, many present and ongoing activities (multiple uses) in the TRNP and on FS lands would potentially impact the project and CE area, including grazing by livestock; various recreation activities (as described in other sections of this EA); and oil, gas, and other commercial development. Additionally, natural expansion of noxious and invasive weeds would possibly impact the project and CE areas.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the vegetation of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes and ongoing activities.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the vegetation of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed construction would cause direct site-specific, long-term, minor impacts on the vegetation of the proposed site because some vegetation would be removed from both the proposed location of the tower and the proposed improvements to the existing access road. These impacts would be minor because of the small size of the site and the localized activities. These impacts would be adverse

because some of the vegetation would be permanently removed and some would be temporarily removed, increasing the potential for short- and long-term increases in soil erosion. These impacts would not be significant to the vegetation communities as a whole because of the small size of the site and mitigation of any impacts resulting from soil erosion through use of soil erosion barriers and BMPs, and re-vegetation efforts. Native seed mixes would be required for all re-vegetation efforts, and the site-specific seed mixture would be specified by the FS in the Private Road Special Use Permit. The amount of vegetation removed would be minimized to reduce the potential of associated soil erosion and to maintain as much natural vegetation on the site as possible. Lastly, mitigation measures to reduce the spread of noxious weeds would be implemented, including pressure spraying vehicles with water before entering and leaving the project area. Also, the area of road reconstruction would need to be spot sprayed, as needed, before reconstruction activity begins. The FS sent letters of concurrence with this assessment (FS 2005d and FS 2005e).

Cumulative Impacts — Operation of the proposed facilities would cause direct site-specific, long-term, minor impacts on the vegetation of the proposed site because managing the vegetation would be necessary to minimize possible damage to the facilities. Management activities would include periodic removal and destruction of vegetation, as well as spraying of herbicides, as approved by the FS, for road maintenance.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific, short- and long-term impacts on the vegetation of the project and CE areas from localized vegetation removal.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the vegetation of the project or CE areas.

4.2.2 Wildlife and Fisheries

Methodology — Natural processes are relied on to control populations of native species to the greatest extent possible; otherwise, they are protected from harvest, harassment, or harm by human activities. Management goals for wildlife include maintaining components and processes of naturally evolving ecosystems, including natural abundance, diversity, and the ecological integrity of wildlife and fisheries. For the impact analyses, overall footprint, configuration, and edge-effect of the proposed activities were examined in the context of the project and CE areas. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- **Negligible** — No observable or measurable impacts on native species, their habitats, or the natural processes sustaining them would occur. Impacts would be of short duration and would be well within natural fluctuations.
- **Minor** — Wildlife and fisheries would be affected by localized disturbance and/or unnaturally elevated predation levels. Few species would be affected, with potential for localized reduction in reproductive success and/or decline in size of small subcolonies. Impacts would be detectable but not outside the natural range of variability. Impacts would not result in any long-term effects on native species, their habitats, or the natural processes sustaining them.
- **Moderate** — Wildlife and fisheries would be affected by disturbance and/or unnaturally elevated predation levels over a broader area. More species would be potentially affected, with potential for long-term abandonment of small subcolonies and moderate reduction in population size (less than 25 percent). Impacts would be detectable and outside the natural range of variability in some cases. Impacts would result in some long-term effects on native species, their habitats, or the natural processes sustaining them.

- **Major** — Many wildlife and fisheries species would be affected by continuous, prolonged disturbance and/or unnaturally elevated predation levels. There would be potential for long-term subcolony with significant reduction in population size (more than 25 percent). Impacts would be detectable and outside the natural range of variability. Impacts would result in long-term effects on native species, their habitats, or the natural processes sustaining them.
- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of the natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity of wildlife and fisheries in the project and CE areas.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact wildlife or fisheries.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the wildlife and fisheries of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the wildlife or fisheries of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would result in permanent removal of some wildlife habitat immediately around the proposed road reconstruction. However, because of the small size of the lost habitat and the abundance of other wildlife habitat in the area, this impact would be minor. Further, the noise generated by construction and maintenance activities would temporarily displace wildlife in the area. This displacement would be temporary because, when the construction activities cease, wildlife would return to the vicinity of the site.

Despite these minor impacts, no change would occur to the overall natural abundance, diversity, and ecological integrity of wildlife and fisheries in the project and CE areas. The proposed project also would not increase fragmentation because:

- The overall footprint of the project area would be the same as the existing footprint.
- No increase in edge-effect would result within the project area.
- The resulting topography and vegetation would allow animal movement through the project area.
- An existing road would receive minimal improvements and would be used infrequently.
- The replacement tower would be the same height as the existing tower.
- The proposed equipment structure would be constructed in an existing fenced footprint.

Implementing the proposed action would improve access to the site and surrounding area, which might increase the likelihood of wildlife poaching in the area. No evidence of previous wildlife poaching in the project area has been noted. If the proposed action is implemented, the NPS would increase patrol of the road to minimize any potential poaching in the project area.

Finally, although negligible loss of migratory bird habitat would result, these species pose a special wildlife concern related to projects such as the proposed action, in accordance with the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

Because of the properties and height of the structure, migratory birds in the area could collide with the tower. Absence of wetlands or bodies of water, and scarcity of forested habitats on the site would reduce the possibility of collisions, because bodies of water and forested habitats usually attract migratory birds; with fewer migratory birds on the site, the potential number of collisions would be small. The impacts on migratory birds would be the same as those now exerted by the existing tower. Long-term use of the wireless telecommunication tower would have negligible impacts on migratory birds.

Verizon Wireless personnel would inspect the tower location regularly, in coordination with NPS and USFWS. If bird strikes were discovered, Verizon Wireless personnel would consult with the appropriate federal and state agencies.

The FS sent letters of concurrence with this assessment (FS 2005d and FS 2005e).

Cumulative Impacts — No reasonably foreseeable future projects are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact wildlife. However, many present and ongoing activities (multiple uses) in the TRNP and on FS lands would potentially impact the project and CE area, including grazing by livestock; various recreation activities (as described in other sections of this EA); and oil, gas, and other commercial development.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific and local, short- and long-term impacts on the wildlife of the project and CE areas through habitat loss and temporary displacement during construction.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the wildlife or fisheries of the project or CE areas.

4.2.3 Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species

Methodology — A list of threatened and endangered species that could occur in the Little Missouri National Grassland was obtained from the USFWS, and a list of sensitive species and raptor species of concern was obtained from the FS (October 28, 2004). The USFWS and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department (NDGF) were consulted for known and potential occurrences of species of concern in the project areas. Current information from raptor nests was obtained from the field survey (conducted May 20-21, 2005) and historical information (Earthworks 2005). A biological assessment/evaluation was completed, which contains the list and description of threatened, endangered, and sensitive species (see the Project File; Earthworks 2005).

The Endangered Species Act defines the thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts, as follows:

- No effect — An action would not affect a listed species or designated critical habitat.
- May affect / not likely to adversely affect — May impact individuals or habitat, but effects on special status species are discountable (for example, extremely unlikely to occur and not able to be meaningfully measured, detected, or evaluated), or are completely beneficial. Any effects would not likely contribute to a trend towards Federal listing or loss of viability to the population or the species.

- May affect / likely to adversely affect — An adverse effect to a listed species may occur as a direct or indirect result of proposed actions, and the effect either is not discountable or is completely beneficial.
- Is likely to jeopardize proposed species / adversely modify proposed critical habitat (impairment) — The NPS or USFWS identifies situations in which the proposal could jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species or adversely modify critical habitat to a species.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - Long-Term — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

Assessments for threatened and endangered species and proposed threatened and endangered species are conducted by evaluating past and present occurrences of the species, and by determining if potential habitat exists within the project area. Based on these two criteria, a determination is made about the project's direct and cumulative effects on each species. Measures to avoid or mitigate potential future effects are provided unless a "no effect" determination occurs.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of the potential presence of threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or habitat supporting such species. No effect on a listed species or designated critical habitat would occur.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact threatened, endangered, or sensitive species, or critical habitat.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the threatened, endangered, or sensitive species that may migrate into the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the threatened, endangered, or sensitive species, or critical habitat, that may occur in the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The analysis of effects of the proposed action is presented by species, below. The project area contains possible habitat for raptor species of concern; therefore, the overall timing stipulation for activities occurring between February 1 and August 15 for active raptor nests would apply to the proposed activities. If the proposed action is implemented, completion of activities would be required prior to February 1, at which time raptors could return to the Little Missouri National Grassland. If construction of the project is delayed or continues into the spring or summer of future breeding seasons, an aerial raptor survey is recommended to search for new nests and ensure that no raptors of concern would be disturbed by the proposed activities. The FS sent letters of concurrence with this assessment (FS 2005d and FS 2005e).

Threatened and Endangered Species

Whooping Crane

Potential roost habitat does not exist in the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the whooping crane.

Black-footed Ferret

Black-footed ferrets were historically found in North Dakota, mostly in the southwest portion of the State. They rely almost exclusively on prairie dogs for food and den sites. The Black-footed Ferret Recovery Plan lists the need to reintroduce ferrets into suitable habitat — large prairie dog towns or complexes of towns in close proximity to each other. The proposed area of reintroduction is not near the project area, nor does the project area offer suitable habitat for this species. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the black-footed ferret.

Bald Eagle

No known bald eagle nest sites, no habitat for breeding pairs, and no communal winter roost sites are within the proposed project area or immediately adjacent to the project site. However, individual specimens could migrate into the project and CE areas during the fall and winter. The proposed action may affect individual specimens during the fall or winter, if construction activities occurred during those seasons, but would not likely contribute to loss of population or species viability. Impacts would include displacement from the immediate project area; therefore, the impacts would be minor and short-term.

Sensitive Species

Baird's Sparrow

The project area provides small inclusions of suitable gently rolling, upland, mixed-grass prairie. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability (Earthworks 2005).

Burrowing Owl

Burrowing owls are closely associated with black-tailed prairie dog habitat. No prairie dog towns occur in the project area. Historical sightings of burrowing owls have not occurred within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the burrowing owl.

Sprague's Pipit

The project area provides inclusions of suitable gently rolling, upland mixed-grass prairie. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability.

Greater Sage Grouse

Sage grouse are closely associated with big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentata*) habitat. No extensive big sagebrush sites are in the project area. Also, there are no sage grouse leks in the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the greater sage grouse.

Loggerhead Shrike

Habitat of open native prairie with scattered thickets does occur in the area. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability.

Long-billed Curlew

Large areas of gently rolling prairie well suited for the long-billed curlew do not occur in the area. The general area has a rough topography. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the long-billed curlew.

Peregrine Falcon

Based on the historical records and aerial survey, no active or inactive peregrine falcon nests occur within or near the project area. Peregrine falcons historically nested in North Dakota in badlands habitat. The last known breeding pair in western North Dakota was recorded in 1954 near Bullion Butte in Billings County (Earthworks 2005). Current habitat use in the badlands is by migratory individuals only. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the peregrine falcon.

Black-tailed Prairie Dog

No black-tailed prairie dog towns are within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the black-tailed prairie dog.

California Bighorn Sheep

The proposed site is located approximately 2 miles north of the Chateau DeMores California bighorn sheep herd. Although sheep could migrate into the project area, this would be unlikely due to the distance between the herd and the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the California bighorn sheep.

Dakota Skipper

The proposed project area provides potential habitat inclusions of undisturbed mixed grass-prairie (tall grass and mid-grass prairie) suitable for Dakota Skipper Butterfly. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability (Earthworks 2005).

Tawny Crescent Butterfly

The proposed project area provides potential habitat inclusions of green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) draws suitable for the tawny crescent butterfly. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability (Earthworks 2005).

Ottoe Skipper

The proposed project area provides potential habitat inclusions of undisturbed mixed grass-prairie (ungrazed prairie where purple coneflower [*Echinacea spp.*] bloom) suitable for the Ottoe Skipper Butterfly. The proposed action may affect individuals or habitat inclusions but would not likely contribute to a trend towards federal listing or loss of population or species viability (Earthworks 2005).

Regal Fritillary Butterfly

The project area does not provide the violet (*Viola spp.*) habitat component and other necessary habitat components to support regal fritillary butterflies. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the regal fritillary butterfly.

Northern Redbelly Dace

No suitable habitat for this species exists within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the northern redbelly dace.

Sturgeon Chub

No suitable habitat for this species exists within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the sturgeon chub.

Raptors of ConcernFerruginous Hawk

Based on the historical records, aerial survey, and field survey, no known active or inactive ferruginous hawk nests occur in the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the ferruginous hawk.

Prairie Falcon

Based on the historical records and field survey, no prairie falcon nests are within 1 mile of the project area. No whitewash areas or falcons were observed during the survey. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the prairie falcon.

Golden Eagle

Based on the historical records and field survey, no known golden eagle nests are within 1 mile of the project area; the nearest documented nest is 1 mile away from the project area. Given the relative proximity of the documented nest, the proposed action would have no effect on the golden eagle.

Merlin

Based on the historical records and field survey, no known active or inactive merlin nests are in the area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the merlin.

Sensitive Plant SpeciesSlimleaf Goosefoot

Habitat suitable for slimleaf goosefoot (i.e., sandy river terraces) does not occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the slimleaf goosefoot.

Blue Lip's

Due to weedy and aggressive introduced species, habitat otherwise suitable for blue lip's has been degraded to the point that it is no longer suitable. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on blue lip's.

Torrey's Cryptantha

Inclusions of habitat suitable for Torrey's cryptantha occur on dry plains. The proposed project area includes dry plains habitat. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect habitat, for Torrey's Cryptantha. The area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation but no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of Torrey's cryptantha.

Nodding Wild Buckwheat

Small inclusions of potentially suitable habitat for nodding wild buckwheat (i.e., open sandy grasslands and hillsides) do occur in the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for nodding wild buckwheat. The area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation but no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of nodding wild buckwheat.

Dakota Buckwheat

Inclusions of habitat for this species (i.e., areas of badlands, clay barren areas, and butte wash areas) are found within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for Dakota buckwheat. The area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation but no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of Dakota buckwheat.

Sand Lily

Inclusions of habitat suitable for sand lily occur on hillsides within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for sand lily. However, the area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation and no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of sand lily.

Scoria Lily or Dwarf Mentzelia

Inclusions of habitat suitable for scoria lily or dwarf mentzelia include arid slopes, sandy plains, or possibly hard clays and rocky soils, and do occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for the scoria lily or dwarf mentzelia. However, the area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation and no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of the scoria lily or dwarf mentzelia.

Alyssum-Leaved Phlox

Habitats suitable for alyssum-leaved phlox include: sandy or gravelly soil, clay banks, and limestone ridges of open prairie. Potential habitat does occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for alyssum-leaved phlox. However, the area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation, and no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of alyssum-leaved phlox.

Lance-Leaf (Rydberg's) Cottonwood

Habitat suitable for lance-leaf cottonwood is riparian area, which does not occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on lance-leaf (Rydberg's) cottonwood.

Alkali Sacaton

Habitat suitable for alkali sacaton occurs on hard clay areas. Potential habitat does occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for alkali sacaton. The project area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation, and despite the fact that specimens are known to occur along West River Road near the project area, no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of alkali sacaton.

Hooker's Townsendia

Habitat suitable for Hooker's townsendia occurs on plains and hillsides, which do occur within the project area. Therefore, the proposed action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, habitat for Hooker's townsendia. The project area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation but no plants of this species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on individual specimens of Hooker's townsendia.

Watch Plant Species (Various)

Watch plant species in a geographic area have demonstrated a downward trend of abundance over time, but have not yet met the threshold of becoming a categorically sensitive species. The watch plant species presented in Table 3-3 are not presently known to occur on the Little Missouri National Grassland or the

surrounding areas. However, portions of the area are likely suited for some of the watch plant species because many species may have a wide tolerance for habitats, while for other species the required habitat has not been closely studied and therefore has been vaguely identified (for example, “occurs on hillsides”). These facts make it difficult to predict if a species would occur on an area without a complete on-site evaluation. The project area was searched thoroughly during the field evaluation but no watch plant species were observed. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on the various watch plant species presented in Table 3-3.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact threatened, endangered, or sensitive species, or critical habitat. However, suitable habitat for some threatened, endangered, or sensitive species does occur in the project area. Therefore, such species potentially could occur or become established in the project area in the future. Routine management for such species on the TRNP and DPG, including periodic surveys for new populations in new areas, would continue in the project area.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have no effect on endangered species; may affect but not likely to adversely affect one threatened species (bald eagle) if construction activities occur during the fall and winter seasons; and may affect sensitive animal and plant species because of the presence of suitable habitat (Baird’s sparrow, Sprague’s pipit, loggerhead shrike, Dakota skipper, tawny crescent butterfly, ottoe skipper, Torrey’s cryptantha, nodding wild buckwheat, Dakota buckwheat, sand lily, scoria lily or dwarf mentzelia, alyssum-leaved phlox, alkali sacaton, and Hooker’s townsendia). The proposed action would have no effect on raptor species of concern or watch plant species.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the threatened, endangered, or sensitive species, or critical habitat, that may occur in the project or CE areas.

4.3 HERITAGE AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Methodology — In this EA, impacts on heritage and cultural resources (archeological resources and the cultural landscape) are described in terms of type, context, duration, and intensity, which is consistent with the CEQ regulations. These impact analyses are intended, however, to comply with the requirements of both the NEPA and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

In accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation’s regulations implementing Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800, “Protection of Historic Properties”), impacts on cultural resources were identified and evaluated by: (1) determining the area of potential effects; (2) identifying cultural resources present in the area of potential effects that were either listed on or eligible to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places; (3) applying the criteria of adverse effect to affected cultural resources either listed in or eligible to be listed on the National Register; and (4) considering ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects.

Under the advisory council’s regulations, a determination of either *adverse effect* or *no adverse effect* must also be made for affected, National Register-eligible cultural resources. An *adverse effect* occurs whenever an impact alters, directly or indirectly, any characteristic of a cultural resource that qualifies it for inclusion on the National Register (for example, diminishing the integrity of the resource’s location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association). Adverse effects also include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the preferred alternative that would occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative (36 CFR Part 800.5, “Assessment of Adverse Effects”). A determination of *no adverse effect* means an effect is not expected or, if expected, would not diminish in any way the characteristics of the cultural resource that qualify it for inclusion on the National Register.

CEQ regulations and DO #12 also call for a discussion of the appropriateness of mitigation, as well as an analysis of how effective the mitigation would be in reducing the intensity of a potential impact (for example, reducing the intensity of an impact from major to moderate or minor). Any resultant reduction in intensity of impact due to mitigation, however, is an estimate of the effectiveness of mitigation only under the National Environmental Policy Act. It does not suggest that the level of effect as defined by Section 106 is similarly reduced. Although adverse effects under Section 106 may be mitigated, the effect remains adverse. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — Impact is at the lowest level of detection – barely measurable with no perceptible consequences, either adverse or beneficial. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *no adverse effect*.
- Minor (adverse) — Disturbance of a site(s) results in little loss of integrity. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *no adverse effect*.
- Minor (beneficial) — Impact would maintain and preserve the site(s). For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *no adverse effect*.
- Moderate (adverse) — Disturbance of a site(s) results in loss of integrity. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *adverse effect*. A Memorandum of Agreement is executed and identifies mitigation measures to reduce the intensity of impact from moderate to minor.
- Moderate (beneficial) — Impact stabilizes the site(s). For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *no adverse effect*.
- Major (adverse) — Disturbance of a site(s) results in a loss of integrity. For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *adverse effect*. The NPS and historic preservation officer are unable to execute a Memorandum of Agreement.
- Major (beneficial) — Impact amounts to active intervention to preserve the site(s). For purposes of Section 106, the determination of effect would be *no adverse effect*.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - Long-Term — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

Description of the file search and cultural resource survey is presented in Section 3.3.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would not cause any direct or indirect impacts on heritage and cultural resources because none of the sites identified in the records search is within 0.25 mile of the project area. The results of recent archaeological surveys conclude that finding other cultural materials in this area would be very unlikely. The FS Principal Investigator/Archeologist and SHPO both agreed with this assessment (FS 2005a, State Historical Society of North Dakota 2005).

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact heritage and cultural resources.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the heritage and cultural resources of the project or CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the heritage and cultural resources known in, or that may occur in, the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would not cause any direct or indirect impacts on heritage and cultural resources because none of the sites identified in the records search is within 0.25 mile of the project area. The results of recent archaeological surveys conclude that finding other cultural materials in this area would be very unlikely. The FS Principal Investigator/Archeologist and SHPO both agreed with this assessment in letters of concurrence (FS 2005a, State Historical Society of North Dakota 2005).

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact heritage and cultural resources.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have negligible long-term impacts on the heritage and cultural resources of the project or CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the heritage and cultural resources known in, or that may occur in, the project or CE areas.

4.4 SOCIAL RESOURCES

This section provides information on the potential impacts on wilderness, scenery resources, transportation and roads, and recreation resources of the TRNP and DPG area.

4.4.1 Wilderness

Methodology — Impact analyses focus on wilderness character or wilderness experience, including the perpetuation of natural ecological relationships and processes, continued existence of native wildlife and vegetation populations, absence of permanent human structures, opportunities for solitude, and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- **Negligible** — Little or no change would occur in wilderness character or wilderness experience. Any change would not be perceptible, or would be barely perceptible, to most visitors.
- **Minor** — One or more attributes of wilderness character and wilderness experience change temporarily or in small ways in one or more locations. Any change would noticeably impact a few visitors' experiences, but would result in little distraction from the quality of the experience.
- **Moderate** — One or more attributes of wilderness character and wilderness experience change substantially in a single distinct region, or affect multiple regions; however, the change is not permanent and does not affect an entire visitor season. The change would noticeably decrease or improve the quality of the experience for a large number of visitors.
- **Major** — One or more attributes of wilderness character and wilderness experience change substantially across more than one distinct region, on either a permanent or frequent but temporary basis, and over an entire visitor season. The change substantially improves many

visitors' experiences or severely lowers the quality of many visitors' experiences; examples include addition or elimination of a recreation opportunity or a permanent change to an area.

- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would not cause any direct or indirect impacts on the perpetuation of natural ecological relationships and processes, continued existence of native wildlife and vegetation populations, opportunities for solitude, and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. The no action alternative would cause indirect, negligible impacts from the continued presence of a permanent human structure near the southern boundary of the wilderness area to the north of the project area – the existing NPS radio tower in the project area. The existing radio tower can be seen from the wilderness area to the north of the project area (see Appendix D).

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact wilderness resources.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the wilderness resources north of the project area because of the continued presence of the existing radio tower.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the wilderness resources near the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would not cause any direct or indirect impacts on the perpetuation of natural ecological relationships and processes, continued existence of native wildlife and vegetation populations, opportunities for solitude, and opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. The proposed action would cause indirect, negligible impacts from the presence of a permanent human structure near the southern boundary of the wilderness area to the north of the project area – the proposed telecommunications tower. The proposed tower would be seen from the wilderness area to the north of the project area (see Appendix D). However, since the proposed tower would be the same height as the existing radio tower, there would be no change to the current conditions and current impacts on wilderness resources caused by the existing tower.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact wilderness resources.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have negligible long-term impacts on the wilderness resources north of the project area because of the continued presence of a tower of the same height as the existing radio tower.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the wilderness resources near the project or CE areas.

4.4.2 Scenery Resources

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on scenery resources, including visitors' experience of observing the landscape and wildlife, impacts on scenic views, and encroachment of development that impacts scenery resources. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — Any change would not be perceptible, or would be barely perceptible, to most visitors.
- Minor — Any change would impact the experience of a few visitors but would result in little change in the quality of the experience.
- Moderate — Any change would impact the experience of a large number of visitors, noticeably decreasing or improving the quality of the experience.
- Major — Any change would substantially improve or severely lower the quality of many visitors' experience; examples include addition or elimination of a scenery resource or a permanent change to an area.
- Duration — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - Short-Term — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - Long-Term — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of visitors' experience of observing the landscape and wildlife, scenic views, and encroachment of development that impacts scenery resources. The existing tower is currently in the viewshed and would continue to impact the viewshed (see Appendix D).

Cumulative Impacts — Verizon Wireless has not proposed any specific alternate locations for the proposed tower at this time because it was determined during the planning stage of the project that building a new tower on non-federal land would generally have significant negative impacts on the scenery and viewsheds of the region. However, should the NPS or the FS decide not to issue the respective permits to Verizon Wireless, the company would more than likely seek alternate locations on non-federal land for the proposed telecommunications tower, to meet the stated need of satisfying the growing demand for commercial and personal communication in the region. Many factors would dictate a specific, alternate location for the proposed facility, including specific radio frequency and coverage requirements of expanding the Verizon Wireless network, but possibly Verizon Wireless would construct an additional tower on nearby, non-federal land in the immediate vicinity and sightline of the existing NPS radio tower. Therefore, in general terms, if the application for permits was denied by the NPS and FS, and if Verizon Wireless selected an alternate location near the proposed project area, the scenery of the region would be negatively impacted by construction of an additional tower (thereby increasing the cumulative number of towers by one). If this scenario developed, it would have the potential to negatively impact TRNP visitor experiences, since a primary reason citizens visit the TRNP is to see the beauty of the North Dakota badlands and prairie scenery, and to observe the wildlife. The viewshed from the nearby wilderness area also would be potentially impacted if Verizon Wireless located an additional tower on non-federal lands near the existing tower.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have the potential to cause minor, local and regional, long-term impacts on the scenery resources of the TRNP, DPG, and the local communities.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the scenery resources, beyond the existing condition, near the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — The proposed action would have minor, long-term impacts on the scenery resources of the area due to a slight difference between the equipment mounted on the existing tower and the equipment proposed to be mounted on the proposed tower. Also, an additional small equipment shed would be constructed within the project area. The existing tower is 180 feet high with a 16.75-inch face and steel diameters of 1.25 inches. The replacement tower is proposed to be 180 feet high and have a 24-inch face (measured center to center); would be a solid steel structure; and would use steel diameters varying from 1.25 inches to 1.75 inches at the bottom of the tower, and 1.25 inches at the top of the tower. The pre-fabricated equipment shed would encompass an area 12 feet by 30 feet. These equipment changes would cause minor differences in how the proposed facility would impact the viewshed, as compared to the existing impacts on the viewshed (see Appendix D for photographic simulations of the existing and proposed conditions). The proposed equipment modifications would cause minor, long-term impacts on the nearby wilderness area, as the site would support an additional equipment shed and additional equipment (microwave dish) that would be seen from the southern boundary of the wilderness area.

The proposed action would also have minor, long-term impacts on the scenery resources of the area due to a slight difference between the existing NFSR and the proposed reconstruction. NFSR #730A-2 is an existing feature on the landscape, and the proposed reconstruction is designed to minimize visual impacts of the road on adjacent lands, allowing the road to remain, as much as possible, subordinate to the natural landscape. The proposed reconstruction would cause only minor differences to the road, including grading and application of surfacing and gravel along specific segments of the existing road corridor. Additionally, total reconstruction of approximately 2000 feet around the switchback (corner) would be necessary. NFSR #730A-2 would maintain the Scenic Integrity Objective of High for the project area.

Cumulative Impacts — The proposed action could have minor, local and regional, long-term, beneficial impacts on the scenery resources of the TRNP, DPG, and the local communities. By replacing the existing tower with one of equal height, the net number of towers would remain constant and the viewshed would not be negatively impacted by the possibility of construction of an additional tower on non-federal lands in the region. Additional minor, long-term impacts from the proposed road reconstruction would occur, although reconstruction would allow the road to remain, as much as possible, subordinate to the natural landscape. NFSR #730A-2 would maintain the Scenic Integrity Objective of High for the project area.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific and local, long-term impacts on scenery resources resulting from a change in the equipment supported by the proposed tower, and the proposed road reconstruction. The proposed action would also have the possibility of causing minor, local and regional, long-term, beneficial impacts by replacing a tower instead of building a new tower in the viewshed.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the scenery resources near the project or CE areas.

4.4.3 Transportation and Roads

Methodology — The Transportation Rule and Policy (66 Federal Register [FR] 3206 and 3219 [Transportation Policy]) requires the FS to determine a minimum road system—determining roads needed (classified) and unneeded (unclassified). Decisions on needed and unneeded roads are accomplished through area/project planning with NEPA analyses and public participation. The Transportation Policy also requires a roads analysis process to inform road management decisions. A roads analysis process (watershed or project area scale) must be prepared before most road management decisions to construct or reconstruct roads throughout the National Forest System lands (whether they be inventoried roadless or not), as of January 12, 2002.

The FS completed a roads analysis for the proposed reconstruction and upgrade NFSR #730A-2. The roads analysis for the proposed project provided the following recommendations and findings for the proposed reconstruction of the NFSR (FS 2005b):

- No soil or hydrology related issues are associated with this proposed road project. The route follows an existing two-track, Maintenance Level 2 road. The route is well located along the drainage divide for much of its length. This location minimizes erosion and overland flow.
- Native seed mixes would be required for all re-vegetation efforts, and the site-specific seed mixture would be specified by the FS in the Private Road Special Use Permit.
- The reconstructed road would provide safe access to the proposed communications tower, and the upgraded communications tower would enhance cellular telephone communications for the general public.
- The road would be placed on the surface in a manner that minimizes the amount of surface used; minimizes impacts; reduces visual impacts through road location and type of surfacing material; minimizes risk to wildlife or rare and unique botanical resources; ensures that cultural resources would not be adversely affected; minimizes impacts on soil and soil erosion; and ensures required reclamation and re-vegetation activities are successfully completed.
- The FS would monitor road construction and maintenance, and ensure completion of tri-annual road condition surveys.
- Upon removal of the proposed communications tower, the road could be reduced back to the original two-track configuration, and maintenance would be reduced.

The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- Negligible — Visitors would not likely be aware of the effects associated with changes proposed to transportation corridors and roads.
- Minor — Visitors would be aware of the effects associated with changes proposed to transportation corridors and roads, but impacts would be slight and short-term.
- Moderate — Visitors would be aware of the effects associated with changes proposed to transportation corridors and roads; impacts would be readily apparent and long-term.

- **Major** — Visitors would be aware of the effects associated with changes proposed to transportation corridors and roads; impacts would be readily apparent and long-term, and would preclude experience of local resources by some future visitors.
- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of the transportation systems and roads in the project and CE areas.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact transportation and roads.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the transportation and roads of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the transportation and roads of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — Traffic flow on the proposed road would slightly increase, as Verizon Wireless employees would conduct normal maintenance of the tower equipment on a regular schedule (usually monthly) during off-peak hours. This would result in minor, site-specific and local, long-term impacts. Also, emergency or alarm calls to the tower would also require access via the proposed road. The number of these types of visits to the site can be estimated at six per year. Additionally, an improved road surface would increase access to the site and area.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact transportation and roads.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific and local, short- and long-term impacts from road reconstruction and minor increase in traffic flow. The proposed action would also have minor, local, long-term beneficial impacts by increasing the quality of the road.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the transportation and roads of the project or CE areas.

4.4.4 Recreation

Methodology — Impact analysis focuses on the effects of the no action alternative and proposed action on recreation, including changes to recreational opportunities and visitors' experiences. The thresholds of change for intensity of impacts and the duration of impacts are:

- **Negligible** — Any change to recreational opportunities would not be perceptible, or would be barely perceptible, to most visitors.

- **Minor** — Any change to recreational opportunities would noticeably impact experience of a few visitors experiences, but would result in little distraction from the quality of the experience.
- **Moderate** — Any change to recreational opportunities would impact experience of a large number of visitors, noticeably decreasing or improving the quality of the experience.
- **Major** — Any change to recreational opportunities would substantially improve or severely lower experience of many visitors; examples include addition or elimination of a recreation opportunity or a permanent change to an area.
- **Duration** — Duration can be defined as either short-term or long-term, as follows:
 - **Short-Term** — Lasting only during the construction period or no longer than one year.
 - **Long-Term** — Essentially a permanent or post-construction impact.

No Action Alternative

Analysis — The no action alternative would leave the project area unchanged in terms of the recreational opportunities and visitors' experiences in the project and CE areas.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact recreation resources.

Conclusion — The no action alternative would have negligible long-term impacts on the recreation resources of the project and CE areas through natural ecological processes.

Impairment — The no action alternative would not impair the recreation resources of the project or CE areas.

Proposed Action

Analysis — By improving the existing road, the proposed action would allow visitors easier access to this portion of the TRNP and DPG. Improved access might increase the likelihood of wildlife poaching in the area, which may , increase the need for additional patrol of the area.

Cumulative Impacts — No present, ongoing, or reasonably foreseeable future actions are planned for the project area or CE area that would impact recreation resources.

Conclusion — The proposed action would have minor, site-specific and local, long-term impacts on recreation in the area.

Impairment — The proposed action would not impair the recreation resources of the project or CE areas.

CHAPTER 5: CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

This chapter presents the agencies, tribes, organizations, and persons contacted during development of this EA, and lists the professionals who prepared this document.

5.1 AGENCIES, TRIBES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS CONTACTED

- Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr., State Historic Preservation Officer (North Dakota) and Director, State Historical Society of North Dakota

5.2 LIST OF PREPARERS

Representatives of the NPS, FS, Verizon Wireless, Tetra Tech EM Inc., and Buell Consulting all contributed to the development of this EA. Contributors are listed below by organization.

National Park Service

- Valerie Naylor, Superintendent, TRNP
- Nick Chevance, Regional Environmental Coordinator, Midwest Region
- Mike Oehler, Wildlife Biologist, TRNP
- Penny Knuckles, Chief of Resource Management and NEPA Coordinator, TRNP

Forest Service

- Tina Thornton, Realty Specialist
- Jeff C. Adams, NEPA Coordinator
- Merv Floodman, Principal Investigator/Archeologist

Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP dba Verizon Wireless

- Andy Edwards, Project Manager

Tetra Tech EM Inc.

- Kimberely Gorman, Project Manager and GIS Specialist
- Daniel F. Barone, NEPA Specialist and Planner
- Harry Parrott, Senior Scientist and Manager
- Raquel Cramlet, Environmental Scientist
- Amber Conforti, NEPA Specialist and Technical Reviewer
- Jack Brunner, Quality Control Coordinator
- Robert DeKosky, Technical Editor

Buell Consulting

- Jake Soper, Project Manager and Site Development

REFERENCES

- Dissmeyer, G.E. (ed.). 2000. *Drinking Water from Forests and Grasslands*. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS). General Technical Report SRS-39. 246 Pages.
- Dunne, T. and L.B. Leopold. 1978. *Water in Environmental Planning*. W.H. Freeman and Company. New York. 818 Pages.
- Earthworks Archaeology & Environmental Investigative Services (Earthworks). 2005. “Verizon Wireless Proposed Cell Tower Entry Project ND04 Rough Rider: Biological Assessment/Evaluation of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species.” June 27.
- Elliot, W.J., D. Page-Dumroese, and P.R. Robichaud. 1996. “The Effects of Forest Management on Erosion and Soil Productivity.” Invited Paper: Symposium on Soil Quality and Erosion Interaction, sponsored by The Soil and Water Conservation Society of America. Keystone, Colorado. July 7. 16 Pages
- Elliot, W.J., D.E. Hall, and D.L. Scheele. 2000. “WEPP Interface for Disturbed Forest and Range Runoff, Erosion, and Sediment Delivery.” FS. 20 Pages. On-line at: <http://forest.moscowfsl.wsu.fswapp.docs/distweppdoc.html>.
- Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc. 2005. “Small Survey Report: Rough Rider Road and Cell Phone Tower Location – A Class III Cultural Resource Pedestrian Survey in Billings County, North Dakota.” May.
- North Dakota Department of Health (ND DoH). 1999. Standards for Water Quality of the State. On-line at: <http://www.state.nd.us/lr/information/acdata/pdf/33-16-02.1.pdf>. Accessed May 2005.
- ND DoH. 2001. *A Guide to Temporary Erosion-Control Measures for Contractors, Designers and Inspectors*. 59 Pages.
- National Park Service (NPS). 1987. *Theodore Roosevelt National Park, North Dakota, General Management Plan*. Theodore Roosevelt National Park. June.
- NPS. 1994. *Theodore Roosevelt National Park, Resource Management Plan*. Theodore Roosevelt National Park. December.
- NPS. 1998. *Theodore Roosevelt National Park Water Resources Management Plan*. 149 pages.
- NPS. 2004. “DO-12 Appendix 1: Environmental Screening Form for the Proposed Action.” Theodore Roosevelt National Park. December.
- NPS. 2005. “Theodore Roosevelt National Park Public Use Statistics.” Theodore Roosevelt National Park. April.
- NPS. Undated. Monthly Climate Data for Medora, North Dakota since 1949. Theodore Roosevelt National Park.
- State Historical Society of North Dakota. 2005. Correspondence concurring with the archaeological findings of Metcalf Archaeological Consultants, Inc. May 24.

- Tetra Tech EM Inc. (Tetra Tech). 2004. "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment ND4 Rough Rider Alt 1 Theodore Roosevelt National Park, Medora, North Dakota 58645." Prepared for Badlands Cellular of North Dakota LP dba Verizon Wireless, Inc. July 7.
- Tetra Tech. 2005a. Results of FSWEPP analysis for conditions of Replacement of a communications tower on the TRNP and Reconstruction of an access road on the DPG. Unpublished data summary. FS Administrative Record.
- Tetra Tech. 2005b. "Watershed Report for Replacement of a Communications Tower on the Theodore Roosevelt National Park and Reconstruction of an Access Road on the Dakota Prairie Grasslands." July.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – National Soil Information System (NASIS). 1995. Billings County data. On-line at: <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov/> and <http://efotg.nrcs.usda.gov/refe>. Accessed May 2005.
- USDA North Dakota Natural Resource Conservation Service. 1944. "Soil Survey for Billings County, North Dakota."
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Forest Service (FS). 1994. "Ecological Subregions of the United States: Section Descriptions." Compiled by W.H. McNab and P.E. Avers. WO-WSA-5
- FS. 2001a. *Dakota Prairie Grasslands Land and Resource Management Plan*. Dakota Prairie Grasslands. May.
- FS. 2001b. *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Northern Great Plains Management Plans Revision*. Dakota Prairie Grasslands. May.
- FS. 2004. "Forest Plan Implementation, National Environmental Policy Act and National Forest Management Act 1900-01 Training Course Materials." Streamline Enterprise, FS, McClellan, California. October.
- FS. 2005a. "2360 Cultural Resources Review for Verizon Wireless Road Upgrade to Cell Phone Tower, Project Number D7-05-14." Completed by Mel Floodman, Principal Investigator/Archeologist.
- FS. 2005b. "Roads Analysis Report for the Access Road to Verizon Wireless Communication Tower."
- FS. 2005c. "Environmental Justice Analysis." December 7.
- FS. 2005d. "Verizon Wireless Cell Tower Entry Project: Assessment of T&E and FS Sensitive Species." July 11.
- FS. 2005e. "Review of Biological Evaluation and Impact Assessment for Verizon Wireless to Reconstruct/Improve an Access Road that Leads to an Existing Radio Tower Located in TRNP, Sec. 17 & 18, T140N, R102W." July 13.
- FS. Undated. Climate data for Mott RR, ND. On-line at: <http://forest.moscowfsl.wsu.edu/cgi-bin/fswepp/rc/copypar.pl>. Accessed May 2005.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2005. National Wetlands Inventory. On-line at: <http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/>. Accessed June 2005.