

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

## ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**NUMBER:** CO-110-2004-037-EA

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

**PROJECT NAME:** Pipeline Gray B-12

**LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** T2N R102W Sec 18 NE SW

**APPLICANT:** Chevron Production Company

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:**

**Proposed Action:** Chevron would construct a 500 foot pipeline from an old well to a header. All construction would be next to the access road. The pipeline would be 4" fiberglass, buried 42" deep. Total disturbance would be less than one half acre.

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

**NEED FOR THE ACTION:** The old pipeline to the existing well leaks. Rather than replace it in place and disturb soil on the old cross country route, Chevron requests approval to put a new pipeline next to the access road.

**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:* No impact

*Mitigation:* None

**CULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is located in the Rangely Field which has been inventoried (Larralde 1982) and is covered by an agreement with the Colorado SHPO which limits the amount of new inventory required in the area.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* It does not appear that any cultural resources will be impacted by 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:*

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, with predominate species of 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 halogeaton 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 halogeaon 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 location provides no habitat suited for occupation by migratory birds during the nesting season. Sparse stands of greasewood immediately adjacent to regularly traveled well access roads do not represent suitable nesting habitat for any bird residing in the Rangely Field's predominantly salt desert community.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would have no conceivable influence on nesting activities of migratory birds. In selecting a route that avoided reoccupation of an old cross-country pipeline corridor, potential to involve locally nesting birds (e.g., horned lark, sage sparrow) was substantially reduced.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Alternative pipeline routing (likely the original cross-country pipeline route) would increase the potential for disrupting nesting activity of birds.

*Mitigation:* none

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

*Affected Environment:* Much of the Rangely Oil Field is colonized by white-tailed prairie dogs. 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, black-footed 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 are wholly reliant on prairie dogs for food and

shelter. This project would be located along an existing well access. Adjacent vegetation is comprised of a sparse stand of greasewood with an annual dominated understory. There is no evidence of prairie dog occupation in the immediate vicinity of the project.

Burrowing owl are uncommon in this Resource Area. These birds return to occupy a prairie dog burrow system in early April and begin nesting soon after. BLM has no historical records of burrowing owl nests in the immediate project area. Because there are no prairie dog burrows in the vicinity of the project area, there is no potential for burrowing owl occupation of the site.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Because there is no prairie dog habitat directly or indirectly associated with the project vicinity, there is no realistic likelihood of adversely influencing individuals or local populations of black-footed ferret, white-tailed prairie dog, or burrowing owl, or the utility or condition of their habitat. By siting the replacement line along an existing access road, Chevron avoids having to disturb and reoccupy an old cross-country pipeline corridor. These old pipeline corridors have a tendency to assume native rangeland character and often support prairie dogs at densities exceeding surrounding rangeland.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Alternative pipeline routes would involve unnecessary increases in corridor length across native or rehabilitated rangeland and increase the likelihood of intersecting greater numbers of prairie dog burrow systems.

*Mitigation:* None

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species:* In terms of habitat available for black-footed ferret, white-tailed prairie dogs and burrowing owl, Coal Oil Basin currently meets Standard 4. Although much of the basin's saltbush, sagebrush, and greasewood communities are dominated by annual weeds—a product of inappropriate grazing and reclamation practices in the past--the basin continues to sustain a well-distributed and viable population of white-tailed prairie dogs, which constitutes suitable habitat for burrowing owl and reintroduced populations of black-footed ferret. The proposed action would complement the meeting of this standard by avoiding reoccupation of a cross-country pipeline corridor and confining disturbance to the margin of an existing access road through habitat currently unsuited for occupation by prairie dogs and their associates.

The no action alternative (alternate pipeline siting) would increase the likelihood of disturbing native or reclaimed rangeland potentially suited for occupation by special status species associated with prairie dogs. Although this alternative would not necessarily detract from meeting the standard, it would fail to act on an opportunity to minimize disruption of rangeland that has undergone long term rehabilitation.

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

*Affected Environment:* No Threatened or Endangered plant species are present in the vicinity of, or will be affected by the proposed action

*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 Threatened & Endangered species:* There is no reasonable likelihood that the proposed action or no action alternative would have an influence on the condition or function of Threatened, Endangered, or Sensitive plant species.

**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 this site.

*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.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Hazardous or other solid wastes will not 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 pipeline is in Stinking Water Gulch which is tributary to the White River below Rangely Colorado. Limited data is available for Stinking Water. Past instantaneous measurements of flow and water quality indicate the water to be high in total dissolved solids.

*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..

## **WETLANDS AND RIPARIAN ZONES (includes a finding on Standard 2)**

*Affected Environment:* There is no wetland or riparian communities directly or indirectly associated with this action. Thus there would be no environmental consequences and no affect on the Public Land Health Standard for Riparian Systems.

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

No Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wilderness Areas, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, or Wild and Scenic Rivers 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.

## **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:* The proposed action intersects with soil mapping unit 16; Chipeta silty clay loam, on 3 to 25 percent slopes.

This shallow, well drained soil is on low, rolling hills and on toe slopes. It formed in residuum derived from calcareous, gypsiferous shale. Areas are rounded to irregular in shape and are 20 to 800 acres in size. The native vegetation is mainly salt-tolerant shrubs and grasses. Elevation is 5,100 to 5,800 feet. The average annual precipitation is 7 to 9 inches, the average annual air temperature is 46 to 50 degrees F, and the average frost-free period is 105 to 135 days.

Typically, the surface layer is light brownish gray silty clay loam about 3 inches thick. The next layer is light olive gray silty clay about 6 inches thick. The underlying material is light

olive gray silty clay that has fine shale chips and seams of crystalline gypsum and is about 9 inches thick. Shale is at a depth of 18 inches. Depth to shale ranges from 10 to 20 inches.

Included in this unit are small areas of Billings and Killpack silty clay loams and Turley fine sandy loam. Included areas make up about 10 to 15 percent of the total acreage. The percentage varies from one area to another.

Permeability of this Chipeta soil is slow. Available water capacity is low. Effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is high.

Most areas of this unit are used for livestock grazing and wildlife habitat. A few areas are used for urban development and the production of oil and natural gas.

The suitability of this unit for rangeland seeding is poor. The main limitations are shallow depth to shale, low precipitation, and slow permeability.

It is in Clayey Saltdesert range site.

*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 if salts leaching from soils become 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 action is located within a Clayey Saltdesert range site along an exiting road. The dominant plant community for this site consists of greasewood, saltbrushes, and big sagebrush, which have an understory of western wheatgrass, and squirreltail. Cheatgrass is an undesirable, invasive, and alien plant species that is prevalent within the locality of the proposed action.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would minimally disturb a of salt tolerant shrub community adjacent to the access road. 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:* Use Standard Seed Mix #1, revegetate all soil disturbances in a timely manner.

*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 Clayey Saltdesert range site. As the proposed action is located along existing roads, 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 achieved through a successful re-vegetation effort, thus increasing preferred plant species within this low producing rangeland, thus contributing to moving toward meeting the Land Health Standard.

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

*Affected Environment:* There are no aquatic systems potentially influenced by this action. Therefore, there would be no related environmental consequences, and no affect on the Public Land Health Standard for Plant and Animal Communities.

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

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is situated in the heavily developed Rangely Oil Field. The pipeline replacement parallels and lies adjacent to an existing road. The corridor supports a sparse greasewood community with a predominantly cheatgrass understory. This portion of the Rangely Field is inhabited throughout the year by a small herd of pronghorn that is thoroughly accustomed to well-field activities.

A number of raptors forage opportunistically across Coal Oil Basin during the summer and winter, the most common being red-tailed hawk and golden eagle. This area provides no special or unique habitat features or forage base for these birds.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* Pipeline installation would involve no woody big game forage resources. Herbaceous components that would be affected by

construction would redevelop and become available almost immediately after construction is complete. Standard reclamation procedures would provide the opportunity to increase the perennial grass component on these corridors in the longer term, increasing ground cover and seed production and prolonging the availability of green herbaceous forage for resident big and non-game animals.

This project would have no conceivable adverse consequence on animal distribution or habitat utility. The short term and routine levels of disturbance associated with pipeline replacement would be of no consequence to big game distribution or use of the basin. Because of the minor levels of habitat alteration and proximity to existing forms of disturbance, this action would have no conceivable adverse consequence on the utility of habitats available for nongame wildlife use.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* Failure to approve this project may increase subsequent and unplanned surface disturbance from repair of failing pipelines and may cause the applicant to redesign pipeline routing and incorporate undisturbed or reclaimed rangeland that has superior utility relative to previously disturbed range both in terms of forage and cover resources for resident wildlife. There would be no opportunity under the no-action alternative to improve herbaceous ground cover and composition along the existing right-of-way as cover and/or forage for resident wildlife in the long term.

*Mitigation:* none

*Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities* (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): Based on the current potential of the site and constraints imposed on the vegetative and animal communities across much of Coal Oil Basin by a strong annual component (i.e., historically imposed annual disclimax), the project area generally meets the Land Health Standard. The proposed action would contribute incrementally to the long term restoration of soil stability and perennial grass cover and thereby aid in meeting the standard by redeveloping a bunchgrass component that would sustain an animal community (particularly small mammals) that more closely resembled population composition and density more appropriate to the historic potential of the site. The no action alternative would not necessarily detract from maintaining the standard in its current state, but would fail to take advantage of an opportunity to reduce the extent of degraded habitats within Coal Oil Basin.

**OTHER NON-CRITICAL ELEMENTS:** For the following elements, those brought forward for analysis will be formatted as shown above.

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		

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

## PALEONTOLOGY

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is located in an area mapped as the Mancos Shales (Tweto 1970) which is not considered a Category I formation meaning it is not known to produce scientifically important fossils on a frequent basis. It does produce invertebrate marine fossils in this area, but only rarely are vertebrate fossils likely to occur.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* It is not likely that scientifically important fossil resources will be impacted by the proposed action.

*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.

## RANGELAND MANAGEMENT

*Affected Environment:* The proposed action is located along an existing road in Pasture 6 of the Artesia Allotment (06308), which is authorized for sheep use during the winter to early spring periods.

The soils within the project locality are principally a Chipeta Silty Clay Loam and the range site is a Clayey Salt Desert. This range site is dominated by a salt desert shrub and grass community, such as mat saltbrush, garnder saltbrush, and shadscale, with an understory consisting of Indian ricegrass, squirreltail, and salina wildrye. Cheatgrass is an undesirable, invasive, and alien plant species that is prevalent within the locality of the proposed action. These brush/grass communities are utilized by sheep for meeting forage requirements, particularly during winter months. This soil type has a high clay content that is highly erosive and receives low

precipitation with rapid runoff, thus limiting forage production and hampering re-vegetation efforts.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* The individual proposed action would have minimal impacts on the authorized grazing use because the amount of new surface disturbance is nominal (along an existing access road) in regards to the scale of the allotments (49,407 total acres). However, previously this allotment has entailed considerable impacts from oil and gas activities, which have resulted in a reduction and fragmentation of available rangelands and in a loss of forage for grazing use.

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 forage species within the rangelands.

Grazing use by sheep in the Allotment can be authorized from November 28<sup>th</sup> through April 20<sup>th</sup>. The proposed action would have some limited impacts during this timeframe while sheep are grazing. This is due to the increased activity associated with the development of the proposed action and temporary decrease in rangelands available for grazing. Impacts to livestock grazing may include such influences as a modification in sheep distribution, reduction in available forage, and impediments to livestock grazing and movement.

Overall, this individual proposed action would have no direct impact on the authorized Animal Unit Months (AUMs) in the allotments. A positive benefit would be received through a successful re-vegetation effort, thus increasing preferred forage plants within this low producing rangeland. However, the cumulative impacts from past, present, and possible future oil and gas activities may have a long-term effect on the native range's carrying capacity, thus influencing the authorized AUMs. This possible affect would be determined during the grazing permit renewal process.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* None

*Mitigation:* None

## **REALTY AUTHORIZATIONS**

*Affected Environment:* The subject lands are public in surface and mineral estates. They have been used for oil/gas related developments for over 50 years. Several pipelines, powerlines and access roads cross the area. While most are owned by Chevron, and authorized under unit operations, one 2-inch, buried pipeline crosses near the proposed facility. This is a water disposal line owned by Equity Oil. In addition, Chevron is the holder of a 3-inch surface natural gas line, also in the same vicinity.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* State law requires the proponent to contact location services to identify existing facilities. The development of the proposed facility would avoid any existing facility, resulting in no adverse impacts.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* The no action alternative we result in no environmental impacts.

*Mitigation:* None

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

*Affected Environment:* These wells are in an area classified as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class 3. VRM Class 3 management allows for development as long as the development does not dominate the new landscape.

*Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action:* This pipeline will follow an existing road, thus visual impacts will be minimal. This project will comply with the guidelines for VRM Class 3 with mitigation as listed below.

*Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:* No impacts.

*Mitigation:* Above ground facilities shall be painted Desert Brown (Munsell Color Chart 10 YR 6/3) or equivalent, to match the surroundings. Areas not needed for production shall be reclaimed in a timely manner.

**CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:** Since the proposed pipeline will follow an existing road, any potential cumulative impacts associated with this project would be minimal. 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 foreseeable development analyzed in the PRMP/FEIS. See the Rangeland Management Section for a discussion of potential cumulative impacts to this resource.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Area of Responsibility</b>
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	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	P. E.	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Wilderness Specialist	Wilderness
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Soils
Jed Carling	Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation
Scott Pavey	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	NRS	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Jed Carling	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland Management
Vern Rholl	Supervisory NRS	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Max McCoy	NRS	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	Wild Horse Specialist	Wild Horses

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

**CO-110-2004-037-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 this pipeline 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.

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

5. 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 if salts leaching from soils become a problem on the surface.

6. 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.

7. Above ground facilities shall be painted Desert Brown (Munsell Color Chart 10 YR 6/3) or equivalent, to match the surroundings. Areas not needed for production shall be reclaimed in a timely manner.

NAME OF PREPARER: Max McCoy

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Scott Perry

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: David T. Wether  
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 01/23/04

ATTACHMENTS: Map of the Location of the Proposed Action

# Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2004-037-EA

