

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2004-040-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): C-65571

PROJECT NAME: APD for Well #8020

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T4S, R98W, NENE sec.2, 6th P.M.

APPLICANT: ENCANA OIL & GAS (USA) INC.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: Figure Four Unit well on private surface adjacent to RBC Road #69.

Proposed Action: The applicant proposes to construct 528' of access road (300'x 30' on BLM), construct well pad (private surface), and install buried steel pipeline adjacent to access road (300'x 60' on BLM). Total surface disturbance on BLM would be approximately 0.6 acre. If the well is a producer, area not needed for production will be contoured and seeded. If the well is a non-producer, the well will be plugged, disturbed area will be contoured back to as near original contours as possible, area seeded and vegetation established.

No Action Alternative: No well would be developed. No well pad or access road would be constructed.

NEED FOR THE ACTION: To respond to the applicants request to exercise lease rights and develop hydrocarbon reserves.

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 designation air sheds or non-attainment areas nearby that would be affected by 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. Following successful seeding of the sites, airborne particulate matter should return to near pre-construction levels

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed well pad and access road have been inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level with no new cultural resources identified in the area of the well inventory.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed well pad and access road will no impact any known cultural resources.

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

Affected Environment: There are no known noxious weeds at the proposed project site. Leafy spurge(*Euphorbia esula*) has been located in the West Hunter Creek drainage, east of the project area. It has also been located near the ridgetop in Sec 14 T4S R98W, approximately 2 miles south of the site of the proposed action. Houndstongue is also located in the general vicinity of the project area, primarily in the drainage bottom, in association with disturbed sites.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action will create earthen disturbance which if it is not promptly and effectively revegetated, will provide numerous safe sites for the establishment of noxious and problem weeds.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas with Native seed mix #7 and eradicate any noxious or problem weeds which occur onsite using materials and methods approved by the authorized officer.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: Non-game populations associated with these ranges are widespread and common throughout mountain shrub, sagebrush and juniper habitats in this Resource Area (e.g., green-tailed and spotted towhee, vesper and lark sparrows). There are no specialized or narrowly endemic species known to occupy the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Approximately 0.6 acres of disturbance will occur on Public Lands as a result of constructing the access road (the pad is on private land). Although this action represents an incremental and longer term reduction in the extent of mountain shrub habitat available for migratory bird breeding functions, implementation of this project would have no measurable influence on the abundance or distribution of breeding migratory birds even at the smallest landscape scale.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Incremental reductions of mountain shrub communities would not occur at this time or place.

Mitigation: None.

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

Affected Environment: No threatened or endangered animals are present in, or in the vicinity of, the project area. No greater sage-grouse presence has been documented within two miles of the project site.

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 animal species, or achievement of this land health standard.

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

Affected Environment: No threatened or endangered plants are present in, or in the vicinity of, the project area.

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, or achievement of this land health standard.

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: No hazardous or other solid wastes would be generated under the no action alternative.

Mitigation Measures: 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 proposed action is in segment 20 of the Colorado Stream Classifications and Water quality Standards, the mainstem of Black Sulphur and Hunter Creeks from their sources to their confluences with Piceance Creek.

A review of the Colorado's 1989 Nonpoint Source Assessment Report (plus updates), the 305(b) report, the 303(d) list and the Unified Watershed Assessment was done to see if any water

quality concerns have been identified. This lease is in a Category 1, Priority 2, watershed (The Lower White) identified in the Unified Watershed Assessment report. The state has reasons to believe this watershed has water quality problems (sediment and salinity loads) that may impair the watershed.

The State has classified this stream segment as Aquatic Life Cold 1, Recreation 2, and Agriculture. The state has further defined water quality parameters with table values. These standards reflect the ambient water quality and define maximum allowable concentrations for the various water quality parameters. The anti-degradation rule applies to this segment meaning no further water quality degradation is allowable that would interfere with or become harmful to the designated uses.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: One problem that could arise from the proposed action would be an increase in sediment transport. Annual runoff from this watershed is dynamic and dependent on some aspects we control, such as the amount of vegetation retained for watershed protection and vegetation density. Depleting the vegetation cover needed to protect watersheds from raindrop impact and runoff could cause short-term erosion problems and increased sedimentation to Black Sulphur Creek and on down to the White River until successful best management practices (BMPs) have been implemented and proven successful. The magnitude of these impacts is dependent on the amount of surface disturbance and climatic conditions during the time the soils are exposed to the elements.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No impacts from the no-action alternative are anticipated.

Mitigation: Through the use of BMPs, keep sediment from leaving the proposed site. All disturbed areas including the cut and fill slopes not necessary for production will be promptly recontoured and revegetated using the recommended seed mix in the Vegetation section below.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: The water quality of the Little Dry Gulch is well within the criteria set by the state, thus meeting the land health standard. The proposed action will not change this status.

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

Affected Environment: No wetland or riparian areas occur within the project area.

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 riparian systems: No wetland or riparian areas occur within the project area. Thus it will have no effect on meeting the land health standard.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, Wilderness Areas, 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 soils have been mapped in an order III soil survey by NRCS and are available from that office for review. Refer to the table below for the type of soils affected by the proposed action.

Proposed Action	Soil Number	Soil Name	Slope	Range site	Salinity	RunOff	Erosion Potential	Bedrock
Well pad off road access	40	Hagga loam		Swale Meadow	2-8	Slow	Slight	>60
Well Pad	96	Veatch channery loam	12-50%	Loamy Slopes	<2	Medium	Moderate to very high	20-40

Revegetation limitations for these soil types include an arid climate and droughty soil condition. This location has *not* been mapped as areas that have fragile soils on slopes greater than 35 %. No special designations have been assigned to this location.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There would be an increase in erosion and sedimentation from overland flows, due to removal of vegetation, soil compaction, and exposure of underlying soil layers. These impacts would be short term during the construction phase and for a period after construction providing successful reclamation occurs.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts are not anticipated.

Mitigation: Apply the following Conditions of Approval from Appendix B of White River ROD/RMP:

96. Water bars or dikes shall be constructed on all of the rights-of-way, and across the full width of the disturbed area, as directed by the authorized officer.

97. Slopes within the disturbed area shall be stabilized by non-vegetative practices designed to hold the soil in place and minimize erosion. Vegetative cover shall be reestablished to increase infiltration and provide additional protection from erosion.

98. When erosion is anticipated, sediment barriers shall be constructed to slow runoff, allow deposition of sediment, and prevent it from leaving the site. In addition, straining or filtration mechanisms may also contribute to sediment removal from runoff

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: Soils at the proposed location meet the criteria established in the Public Land Health Standard. The proposed action would not change this status.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Vegetation at the project site is predominately a mixed mountain big sagebrush /Utah serviceberry plant community with 5- 20 year old pinyon pines invading the site and a diverse understory of grasses and forbs.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action will disturb the existing native plant community on a small scale . With effective revegetation and proper noxious and problem weed management, there will be no significant impact to vegetation on either a watershed or landscape scale.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation.

Mitigation: Promptly recontour and revegetate all disturbed areas with Native seed mix #7 and eradicate all noxious and problem weeds using materials and methods as authorized by the Field Manager.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Vegetation at the project site currently meets the Standard and will continue to meet the standard with implementation of the proposed action.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: There is no aquatic wildlife occurring within the project area.

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): There is no aquatic wildlife occurring within the project area. Thus there would be no effect on achievement of the land health standard.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: This project involves the construction of 0.1 miles of road across BLM lands. Total surface disturbance is 0.6 acres. The area of disturbance consists of mountain shrub (e.g., service berry, sagebrush) with some young pinyon and juniper. The pad aspect is slightly northwest at an elevation of 7700 feet. The project area occurs within normal winter range for mule deer and elk. No raptor nesting habitat exists within the project area (pinyon-juniper is too young to support nests).

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The construction of this project will result in a long-term increase of road traffic associated with commercial oil/gas related activities. It will result in a net loss of mountain shrub habitat of approximately 0.6 acres. The location of oil/gas facilities in areas previously undisturbed by commercial oil/gas activities results in incremental reductions of normal winter range habitat for big game.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Failure to construct this well would reduce short-term construction activity levels in this area as well as longer term activity associated with increased road traffic. However, avoiding the disturbance associated with this well would not be considered advantageous to wildlife resources since new locations, potentially involving greater surface disturbance and more involved access, would likely be proposed to offset the loss.

Mitigation: A locked gate shall be placed at the intersection of County Road 69 and the site of new road construction, or as close as practical, to preclude the use by motorized vehicles to avoid disturbance to big game.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): This project would not jeopardize the viability of any animal population. It would have no significant consequence on terrestrial habitat condition, utility, or function, nor have any discernible affect on animal abundance or distribution at any landscape scale. Thus, potential for meeting the land health standard would not be affected.

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
Hydrology/Water Rights	X		
Law Enforcement		X	
Paleontology			X
Rangeland Management		X	
Realty Authorizations	X		
Recreation			X
Socio-Economics		X	
Transportation			X
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

GEOLOGY AND MINERALS

Affected Environment: The surface geologic formation of well location # 8020 is Uinta and Encana's targeted zone is in the Mancos. It is located in an area that is identified in the RMP as available for oil shale leasing using underground mining methods. During drilling potential water, oil shale, coal, oil and gas zones will be encountered from surface to the targeted zone.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The cementing procedure of the proposed actions isolates the formations and will prevent the migration of gas, water, and oil between formations. The oil shale zones in 8020 and the coal zones located the Mesaverde will also be isolated during this procedure. However, conventional recovery of the coals that will be intersected in 8020 is not considered feasible. Development of this well will deplete the hydrocarbon resources in the targeted formation.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed well pad and access road location is in an area mapped as the Uinta Formation (Tweto 1979) which the BLM has classified as a Category I formation meaning it is known to produce scientifically important fossil remains, vertebrate, invertebrate and plant.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: If it should become necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock at any time to construct the access road, level the well pad or excavate the reserve/blooiie pit there is the potential to impact or destroy scientifically important fossils.

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

Mitigation: If, at any time, it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock to construct the access road, level the well pad or excavate the reserve/blooiie pit a paleontological monitor shall be present. 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.

RECREATION

Affected Environment: The proposed action occurs within the White River Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). BLM custodially manages the ERMA to provide for unstructured recreation activities such as hunting, dispersed camping, hiking, horseback riding, wildlife viewing and off-highway vehicle use.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The public will lose approximately one acre of dispersed recreation potential while wells are in operation. The public will most likely not recreate in the vicinity of these facilities and will be dispersed elsewhere. If action coincides with hunting seasons (September through November) it will most likely disrupt the experience sought by those recreationists and will most likely result in complaints from hunters that have historically used this area.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No loss of dispersed recreation potential and no impact to hunting recreationists.

Mitigation: None.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: The proposed action is located within a VRM class III area. The objective of this class is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. Management activities may attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. Changes should repeat the basic elements found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is located below the crest of the ridgeline adjacent to Rio Blanco County road #69 in a plant community of serviceberry/sagebrush and pinyon/juniper vegetation. The well pad is on private surface and a portion (approx. 300') of the access road will be on BLM. Since RBC #69 is on the crest of the ridge, the proposed location would be visible for a brief period of time by a casual observer traveling along RBC #69. The proposed action would not dominate the view and the level of change to the characteristic landscape would be low. The standards of the VRM III classification would be retained.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no additional environmental impacts from the no action alternative.

Mitigation: Paint all production equipment and facilities Juniper Green to blend with surrounding vegetation.

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.

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Caroline	Hollowed	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
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species
Glenn Klingler	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Glenn Klingler	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Marty O'Mara	HazMat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Caroline	Hollowed	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Glenn Klingler	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Caroline	Hollowed	Soils
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation
Scott Pavey	Planner	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	Natural Resource Specialist	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland Management
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Keith Whitaker	Natural Resource Specialist	Visual Resources
Scott Pavey	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	Wild Horses

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

CO-110-2004-040-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 development of Well #8020 as described in the proposed action, with 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. Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas with Native seed mix #7 and eradicate any noxious or problem weeds which occur onsite using materials and methods approved by the authorized officer.
4. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by this project.
5. Through the use of best management practices, keep sediment from leaving the proposed site. All disturbed areas including the cut and fill slopes not necessary for production will be promptly recontoured and revegetated using the recommended seed mix.
6. Water bars or dikes shall be constructed on all of the rights-of-way, and across the full width of the disturbed area, as directed by the authorized officer.
7. Slopes within the disturbed area shall be stabilized by non-vegetative practices designed to hold the soil in place and minimize erosion. Vegetative cover shall be reestablished to increase infiltration and provide additional protection from erosion.
8. When erosion is anticipated, sediment barriers shall be constructed to slow runoff, allow deposition of sediment, and prevent it from leaving the site. In addition, straining or filtration mechanisms may also contribute to sediment removal from runoff.
9. A locked gate shall be placed at the intersection of County Road 69 and the site of new road construction, or as close as practical, to preclude the use by motorized vehicles to avoid disturbance to big game.
10. If, at any time, it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock to construct the access road, level the well pad or excavate the reserve/blooiie pit a paleontological monitor shall be present. 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.

11. Paint all production equipment and facilities Juniper Green to blend with surrounding vegetation.

NAME OF PREPARER: *Keith W. Pitman*

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: *S. J. P.*

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: *Deann R. Bell*
Acting Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: *3/5/04*

ATTACHMENTS: Map of the Location of the Proposed Action

Location of proposed Action CO-110-2004-040-EA

