

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

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**NUMBER:** CO-110-2004-150-EA

**CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER** (optional): Rangely Weber Sand Unit

**PROJECT NAME:** Pipelines

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** From A.C. McLaughlin 30, T2N R103W Sec 14 NENW to A.C. McLaughlin 44, T2N R103W Sec 11 SESW; and from C.T. Carney 5-34, T2N R102W Sec 34 SENW to Collection Station 30, T2N R102W Sec 34 SWNE.

**APPLICANT:** Chevron Production Company

### **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:**

**Proposed Action:** Chevron proposes to bury injection lines and flowlines to the above mentioned wells. Only one trench 42 inches deep will be dug from the wells to existing main lines and collection station. A 40 foot disturbance is requested. This disturbance will be reclaimed to BLM specifications. Total disturbance will be about 3 acres.

**No Action Alternative:** No pipelines would be installed. No construction would occur.

**NEED FOR THE ACTION:** Chevron has requested approval of this action to develop their Federal mineral lease.

**PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW:** The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with the following plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3):

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

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Decision Number/Page: Page 2-5

Decision Language: "Make federal oil and gas resources available for leasing and development in a manner that provides reasonable protection for other resource values."

## **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT / ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES / MITIGATION MEASURES:**

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

### **CRITICAL ELEMENTS**

#### **AIR QUALITY**

*Affected Environment:* There are no special air quality designations or non-attainment areas in the vicinity of the proposed action.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would result in short term, local impacts to air quality during and after construction, due to dust being blown into the air. However, airborne particulate matter should not exceed Colorado air quality standards on an hourly or daily basis.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None.

*Mitigation:* None

#### **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Affected Environment:* From A.C. McLaughlin 30, T2N R103W Sec 11 SESE to A.C. McLaughlin 44, T2N R103W Sec 14 NENW: The proposed injection and production flow lines are located in an area that has been inventoried (Larralde 1981, Compliance dated 2/18/1981) and is covered by an agreement with the Colorado SHPO with no important cultural resources in the area.

From C.T. Carney 5-34, T2N R102W Sec 34 SENW to Collection Station 30, T2N R102W Sec 34 SWSE: The proposed injection and production flow lines are located in an area that has been inventoried (Larralde 1981, Compliance dated 2/18/1981) and is covered by an agreement with the Colorado SHPO with no important cultural resources in the area.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* From A.C. McLaughlin 30, T2N R103W Sec 11 SESE to A.C. McLaughlin 44, T2N R103W Sec 14 NENW: There would be no new impacts to known cultural resources under the proposed action.

From C.T. Carney 5-34, T2N R102W Sec 34 SENW to Collection Station 30, T2N R102W Sec 34 SWSE: There would be no new impacts to known cultural resources under the proposed action.

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

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

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

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

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

**INVASIVE, NON-NATIVE SPECIES/RECLAMATION:** (This includes vegetation information related to Public Land Health Standard 3.)

*Affected Environment:* The vegetation type of the area is a salt desert shrub type; dominate plant species are matt saltbush, Gardner saltbush, various forbs and grasses. Generally plant cover does not exceed 10%. The plant community is the result of the soils which contain high amounts of clay and salt, which produces austere growing conditions.

Noxious weeds which occur in the area include halogeaon and cheatgrass. Both of these species are highly adapted to disturbed soils. Both of these species are effectively controlled by

establishment of seeded species. There is always the opportunity for other noxious weed species to be transported onto the proposed action locations by construction and support equipment

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed seed mix contains non-native species. This seed mix was recommended because the plant species are highly adapted to this site and offer the greatest opportunity to establish vegetation cover and the resultant soil stabilization. These non-native species have not been found to move offsite or interbreed with the adjacent plant species.

Prompt reclamation would prevent cheatgrass and halogeaton from establishing on disturbed sites. If other noxious weeds were to invade the site, prompt control would prevent movement to the adjacent plant communities.

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

*Mitigation:* - Use standard seed mix #1 for reclamation.

Application of herbicides must be under field supervision of an EPA certified pesticide applicator. Herbicides must be registered by the EPA and application proposals must be approved by the BLM.

## **MIGRATORY BIRDS**

*Affected Environment:* The project area is encompassed by salt desert shrublands consisting principally of low density stands of Gardner saltbush. Herbaceous ground cover is generally sparse and is dominated by weedy introduced forbs (e.g., clasping pepperweed) and seeded reclamation grasses (on adjacent reclaimed pipeline corridors). In those areas potentially influenced by pipeline installation, substrate available for nesting birds is appropriate only for ground and burrow nesting species (e.g., common poor-will, horned lark, western meadowlark, burrowing owl). Burrowing owl is discussed in more detail in the special status species section below.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would involve the clearing of about 1.5 acres of salt-desert shrub community; the remaining 1.5 acres consists of reclaimed grasses. In the context of bird nesting, the utility of Gardner saltbush is limited to ground cover--similar to that of native and seeded bunchgrasses. The direct loss of this shrubland type as nest habitat would be minor in relative extent (saltbush types comprise about 10,000 acres in Coal Oil Basin). The loss of saltbush shrubs may persist for several decades, but it is reasonable to assume that bunchgrasses seeded during reclamation would provide comparable nest cover in the interim. Construction of this project is scheduled to commence in the fall of 2004, would be completed well in advance of the upcoming nesting season (beginning in early May), and would have no potential to interfere with nesting efforts.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence the reproductive activities or habitat of migratory birds.

*Mitigation:* None.

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

*Affected Environment:* Much of the project area is broadly encompassed by white-tailed prairie dog habitat. Based on recent site inspections, the ridgeline pipeline route proposed in section 34 supports no prairie dogs. The proposed pipeline in section 14 would bisect several hundred feet of low density prairie dog town on native rangeland, but prairie dog activity in the project area is primarily associated with a previously constructed, parallel pipeline. Burrow occupancy rates were high throughout. Prairie dog burrow entrances within 30 feet of the pipeline's centerline were associated with 14 single-entrance burrows and 2 burrows associated with mounded systems. In contrast, the adjacent reclaimed pipeline trench (about 10-foot width) supports 40 single-entrance burrows and 4 mounded systems. The breaking of heavy soils and claypans from earthwork apparently aids prairie dog burrowing and is not an uncommon situation in the Rangely Field.

Prairie dogs and their burrow systems are important components of burrowing owl (a State threatened species) habitat, as well as potential habitat for reintroduced populations of black-footed ferret. Under the auspices of a non-essential, experimental population rule, ferrets have been released annually southwest and northeast of the Rangely Oil Field since 1999. The rule applies to any ferrets that may occupy or eventually be released in northwest Colorado and northeast Utah. Although there are lesser physical barriers and habitats unoccupied by prairie dog between the release sites and the project site, there is potential that ferrets have reached this portion of Coal Oil Basin. Ferrets breed in February and March with parturition in mid- to late-May. Kits emerge from natal burrows in mid-July.

Burrowing owls are uncommon in this Resource Area. These birds return to occupy a prairie dog burrow system in early April and begin nesting soon after. Young birds are normally fledged by late July with family groups remaining together through September, when the birds leave for southern wintering grounds. BLM has no historical records of burrowing owl nests in the immediate project area, nor was any indications of nesting observed during on-site inspections in early July 2004.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Surface (i.e., ROW clearing) and subsurface (i.e., trenching and pad cuts) disturbance within past or recently occupied prairie dog habitat would be confined to less than 1 acre (i.e., section 14 site). Due to the broad distribution of prairie dogs in this area, there were no reasonable alternatives found that would substantively reduce prairie dog burrow involvement. Temporary removal of vegetation along the working corridor would not adversely affect the integrity of the 10 prairie dog burrows lateral to the trench. Pipeline trenching would likely intersect 6 single-entrance burrows. Although BLM has

no evidence to suggest that ferrets currently occupy Coal Oil Basin, the probability of subsurface disturbance intersecting a prairie dog burrow system occupied by a ferret in Coal Oil Basin would be remote (e.g., assuming random ferret distribution: 1 acre of 7,000 acres of occupied habitat = 0.015%). Because burrowing tends to be confined to the excavated trench, the proposed pipeline offset is considered sufficient to avoid any subsurface disruption of burrows associated with the existing flowline.

In the case of the owl, prairie dog, and ferret it would be advantageous to schedule earthwork outside the period between April 1 and July 15. Avoiding this timeframe would provide sufficient time for the rearing, emergence, and dispersal of young from natal burrows and effectively eliminate the likelihood of adversely affecting these animals' reproductive efforts. This method of cooperatively minimizing risk to ferrets outside designated ferret management areas is consistent with the Wolf Creek Ferret Management Plan.

This project would have no short or long term influence on prairie dog abundance or distribution by itself or as habitat for black-footed ferret or burrowing owl. Small incremental gains in perennial grass cover associated with successful reclamation and subsurface tillage associated with 0.75 mile of parallel pipeline installation, may be expected to bolster local populations of prairie dogs and potentially benefit individual burrowing owl and black-footed ferret on an incremental basis.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Although by denying this application there would be no possible involvement of prairie dog burrow systems as potential habitat for burrowing owl or black-footed ferret, it is uncertain what type of habitat alternative routes may traverse or how delays would affect project timing. Denying this application may also detract from the continued cooperation extended to BLM by Chevron in adjusting project work to accommodate important ferret and burrowing owl timeframes (e.g., breeding).

*Mitigation:* Pipeline trenching and installation will be conducted outside the period of April 1 to July 15 to avoid the remote chance of disrupting the reproductive activities of ferrets, burrowing owl, and prairie dogs.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species:* Public Land Health Standards for those special status species associated with white-tailed prairie dogs, including black-footed ferret and burrowing owl, in Coal Oil Basin are currently being met. This project would have no adverse influence on populations, available extent of suitable habitat, or the reproductive activities of these three species and would, therefore, have no influence on continued meeting of the land health standard. Small incremental gains in perennial grass cover associated with successful reclamation and offset subsurface tillage associated with pipeline installation may be expected to bolster (on a very small scale) local populations of prairie dogs and potentially benefit individual burrowing owl and black-footed ferret.

## **WASTES, HAZARDOUS OR SOLID**

*Affected Environment:* There are no known hazardous or other solid wastes on the subject lands. No hazardous materials are known to have been used, stored or disposed of at sites included in the proposed action.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* No listed or extremely hazardous materials in excess of threshold quantities are proposed for use in this project. While commercial preparations of fuels and lubricants proposed for use may contain some hazardous constituents, they would be stored, used and transported in a manner consistent with applicable laws, and the generation of hazardous wastes would not be anticipated. Solid wastes would be properly disposed of.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no-action alternative.

*Mitigation:* The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by this project.

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

*Affected Environment:* The pipelines are in Stinking Water Gulch which is tributary to the White River below Rangely Colorado and the White River above the state line. Limited data is available for Stinking Water and this lower end of the White River. Past instantaneous measurements of flow and water quality for Stinking Water Gulch indicate the water to be high in total dissolved solids. An historic gaging station was located on the White River at the State line. This data indicated the water quality to good, but high in sediment during storm events.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Impacts to water quality from development of these pipelines would be similar to other surface disturbing activities. Some of the impacts would be exposure of soil surface to wind and water erosion, reduced water quality due to erosion of sediment and salt, off pipeline rights of ways, and piping or rill erosion where pipeline disturbance are exposed to climatic elements. These impacts would be short term until re-vegetation has occurred.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Impacts are not anticipated from not allowing the proposed action.

*Mitigation:* None

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality:* The proposed action will not have an affect on Sinking Water, which is currently well within the standards set by the State, and thus meets the Public Land Health Standard.

## **CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:**

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

**NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS**

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

**SOILS** (includes a finding on Standard 1)

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

Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Range site	Salinity	RunOff	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
8	Billings-Torrifluvents complex gullied	0-5%	Alkaline Slopes/None	2-8	Rapid	High	>60
16	Chipeta silty clay loam	3-25%	Clayey Saltdesert	4-16	Rapid	High	10-20
18	Chipeta-Killpack silty clay loam	3-15%	Clayey Saltdesert	4-16	Rapid	High	10-20

All of the soils identified in the table above have been mapped as being saline in the White River ROD/RMP.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Short-term impacts would be expected from any surface disturbing activity. Impacts from the proposed action would be loss of the protective vegetation cover, possible increase in salt and sedimentation during storm events and soil compaction from trenching equipment. These impacts could continue until successful re-vegetation has occurred.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* In the no-action alternative, neither the surface disturbance nor the impacts to soils resources would occur.

*Mitigation:* Re-establishing vegetation as soon as allowable would be favorable to control any erosion problems that may occur. Best management practices will need to be implemented to collect salts leaching from soils if it becomes a problem on the surface.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils:* The proposed action will not affect the soil type's ability to meet the Land Health Standard.

## **VEGETATION** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* The proposed project is located in a salt desert shrub community, which is dominated by shadscale, matt saltbush, Gardner saltbush, with an understory consisting of bottlebrush squirrel-tail, western wheatgrass, salina wildrye, and invaded by cheatgrass. Soils associated with these plant communities generally have a high clay and salt content that limits plant growth and cover. Under the proposed action of reuse of existing right-of-ways, new disturbance of rangelands will be limited to less than 1 acre.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would disturb a low seral class of desert shrub community for a total of less than 1 acre. The remainder of the project is within existing right-of-ways. The short-term soil and vegetation disturbances would be offset in the long-term by reclaiming the disturbed area with a seed mix that is suited for this ecological site. As this area has a significant component of cheatgrass within the plant community, successful re-vegetation efforts would increase desirable plant species within the rangelands.

Previously this area has entailed considerable impacts from oil and gas activities from a network of well pads, pipeline corridors, and access roads, which have resulted in a fragmentation and reduction of available, productive range sites.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None

*Mitigation:* None

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The proposed action would disturb a small segment of the Alkaline Slope range site. As the majority of the proposed action is located along existing right-of-ways, further fragmentation of plant communities would be minimal.

The locality of the proposed action lacks desirable plant species at an appreciable density and frequency level. This is due to the prevalence of cheatgrass within the vegetative understory. A positive benefit would be received through a successful re-vegetation effort, thus increasing preferred plant species within this low producing rangeland.

## **WILDLIFE, AQUATIC** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* There are no aquatic habitats conceivably affected by this action. The White River, representing the nearest aquatic habitat, is separated from the project area by three to eight miles of ephemeral channel.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* None.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None.

*Mitigation:* None.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): This project would have no conceivable influence on aquatic habitat conditions addressed in the Standards.

### **WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL** (includes a finding on Standard 3)

*Affected Environment:* This heavily developed portion of Coal Oil Basin is inhabited year-round by a small resident herd of pronghorn. These animals are acclimated to routine oil and gas production activities. A number of raptors forage opportunistically during the winter in Coal Oil Basin, the most common being rough-legged and red-tailed hawks, and golden eagle. The project area and the surrounding area provide no special or unique habitat features (e.g., nesting substrate) or forage base for these birds.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Post-construction reclamation normally provides herbaceous forage opportunity for big game in excess of that which exists, in many cases helping to replace understories dominated by annual weeds. This project's reuse of existing right-of-way disturbance limits further involvement of saltbush forage to less than 1 acre. The project would have no conceivable adverse consequence on big game distribution or habitat utility. The short term and routine levels of disturbance associated with pipeline construction and well development would be of no consequence to big game or raptor distribution, or use of adjacent areas within the basin

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* There would be no action authorized that would have potential to influence local wildlife or associated habitat conditions. Conversely, there would be no opportunity under the no-action alternative for small-scale improvements to herbaceous ground cover and composition as cover and/or forage for resident wildlife.

*Mitigation:* None.

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): Much of the ground cover within the Rangely Field is dominated by annual weeds. Although these sites in and of themselves cannot be considered meeting the definition of the land health standard, the majority of the shrubland communities comprising this landscape retain sufficient character to support viable populations of resident game and nongame species, albeit at population densities reduced from potential. This action would not expand the extent of existing pipeline or access corridors in the Rangely Field, and once the pipelines are installed and reclaimed, the disturbed acreage would have no discernible influence on the suitability or integrity of habitat for resident wildlife. Subsequent reclamation offers an opportunity to reestablish herbaceous forage and cover conditions (i.e., redevelopment

of a perennial bunchgrass component) more consistent with the proper functioning of these arid salt desert communities as wildlife habitat.

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

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

## ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION

*Affected Environment:* The proposed actions occur within an area where travel is limited to existing routes yearlong.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Potential exists for pipeline routes to be used for motor vehicle travel on new currently non-existent routes. .

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None.

*Mitigation:* None.

## PALEONTOLOGY

*Affected Environment:* From A.C. McLaughlin 30, T2N R103W Sec 11 SESE to A.C. McLaughlin 44, T2N R103W Sec 14 NENW: The proposed injection and production flowline is located in an area mapped as the Mancos Shale (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has not classified as a Category I formation. The formation does produce marine fossils, primarily invertebrates though there are rare vertebrates.

From C.T. Carney 5-34, T2N R102W Sec 34 SENW to Collection Station 30, T2N R102W Sec 34 SWSE: The proposed injection and production flowline is located in an area mapped as the

Mancos Shale (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has not classified as a Category I formation. The formation does produce marine fossils, primarily invertebrates though there are rare vertebrates.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* From A.C. McLaughlin 30, T2N R103W Sec 11 SESE to A.C. McLaughlin 44, T2N R103W Sec 14 NENW: It is possible though very unlikely that the proposed action will impact scientifically important fossil resources.

From C.T. Carney 5-34, T2N R102W Sec 34 SENW to Collection Station 30, T2N R102W Sec 34 SWSE: It is possible though very unlikely that the proposed action will impact scientifically important fossil resources.

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

*Mitigation:* If paleontological materials (fossils) are uncovered during project activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities that might further disturb such materials, and contact the authorized officer (AO). The operator and the authorized officer will consult and determine the best option for avoiding or mitigating paleontological site damage.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

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

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Activities may be seen but as the predominant view is that of an industrialized area, it is unlikely that this action will be noticeable. VRM class IV objectives will be met.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None.

*Mitigation:* None.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:** Cumulative impacts from oil and gas development were analyzed in the White River Resource Area Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS) completed in June 1996. Current development, including the proposed action, has not exceeded the cumulative impacts from the foreseeable development analyzed in the PRMP/FEIS.

## **REFERENCES CITED**

Larralde, Signa L.

1981 Cultural Resource Inventory of a Sample of BLM Lands in the Rangely Oil Field, Rio Blanco County, Northwestern Colorado. Prepared for Chevron USA, Inc. Nickens and Associates, Montrose, Colorado.

Tweto, Odgen

1979 Geologic Map of Colorado. Unites States Geologic Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

**PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:**

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:**

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

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

## **CO-110-2004-150-EA**

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

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

### **MITIGATION MEASURES:**

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

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

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

2. Pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(g) the holder of this authorization must notify the AO, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. Further, pursuant to 43 CFR 10.4(c) and (d), you

must stop activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it for 30 days or until notified to proceed by the authorized officer.

3. Use standard seed mix #1 for reclamation.

SPECIES (VARIETY)	LBS. PLS/ACRE
Siberian wheatgrass (P27)	3
Russian wildrye (Bozoisky)	2
Crested wheatgrass (Hycrest)	3

4. Pipeline trenching and installation will be conducted outside the period of April 1 to July 15 to avoid the remote chance of disrupting the reproductive activities of ferrets, burrowing owl, and prairie dogs.

5. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by this project.

6. Re-establishing vegetation as soon as allowable would be favorable to control any erosion problems that may occur. Best management practices will need to be implemented to collect salts leaching from soils if it becomes a problem on the surface.

7. If paleontological materials (fossils) are uncovered during project activities, the operator is to immediately stop activities that might further disturb such materials, and contact the authorized officer (AO). The operator and the authorized officer will consult and determine the best option for avoiding or mitigating paleontological site damage.

**COMPLIANCE/MONITORING:**

**NAME OF PREPARER:** Max McCoy

*Max McCoy*

**NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR:**

*Caroline P. Hallowed 8/27/04*

**SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:**

*Therese E. Walter*

Field Manager

**DATE SIGNED:**

*8/27/04*

**ATTACHMENTS:** Location map of the proposed action.

# Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2004-150-EA

