

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2004-089-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC48513

PROJECT NAME: Pipeline Connection Fed 26-1 & Fed 26-2

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado
T. 3 S., R. 101 W.,
Sec. 26, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

APPLICANT: BTU Energy

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: BTU Energy has applied for a pipeline connection between the Fed 26-1 and the Fed 26-2.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is for a pipeline connection between the Fed 26-2 and the Fed 26-1. The gas from these wells is transported by Canyon Gas Resources. Each well has a separate meter that is owned and operated by Canyon. Due to incurred costs associated with each meter, Canyon has recently requested that BTU connect these two wells, via a pipeline, in order to eliminate one of these meters. The proposed pipeline connection will be 2,000 feet in length with a width of 35 feet encompassing 1.61 acres more or less.

The project would include using a small trencher to dig a trench from the Fed 26-2, through the flat, sage and grass pastureland in the bottom of Brushy Point Draw, for approximately 2,000 feet to the Fed. 26-1. The pipeline would consist of buried 2-inch steel pipe. A tractor with back-blade will be used to smooth and level the area to original condition.

No Action Alternative: The no action alternative would deny the application and a different way would have to be found to get the product to a gas market.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD:

NEED FOR THE ACTION:

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: Pages 2-49 thru 2-52

Decision Language: “To make public lands available for the siting of public and private facilities through the issuance of applicable land use authorizations, in a manner that provides for reasonable protection of 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 Northwest Pipeline Corporation A-12 lateral which runs on the east side of the road shown on the White Coyote Draw 7.5' USGS quad map was inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level (Burney, Wheeler and Lennon 1979, Compliance Dated 7/13, 1979) to a width of 25 yards either side of the centerline of the pipeline. No resources were identified in the area identified in section 26 where the new line is proposed.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: If the new line is installed in accordance with mitigation measures there will be no impacts to 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 new pipeline must be placed adjacent to the existing access road up Brushy Point Draw, within 50 feet of the existing Northwest Pipeline centerline. 2. 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.

3. 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: The project area is a sagebrush/western wheatgrass bottom. Predominate species include; Wyoming big sagebrush, greasewood, western wheatgrass, and a variety of other forbs and grasses. Soils are deep but highly erosive as evidenced by the deep gulleys of the area. No noxious weed inventories have been conducted for this area. There are several weeds of concern for this area including; cheatgrasses, houndstongue, musk thistle, bull thistle, and the knapweeds. All of these noxious weeds are adapted to this site.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Following seeding this project would reclaim to a point of stabilizing soils within three years. The seed mix recommended contains non-native species. These are recommended because of their ability to out-compete cheatgrass, grazing tolerance, seedling vigor and high soil holding capabilities. These species have not been shown to move offsite or to interbreed with the adjacent native plant communities.

Following the mitigation for control of noxious weeds no problems are expected.

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

Mitigation: From the WRRRA RMP of 1997, Appendix B, 186. Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Area Manager.

187. Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.

188. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in table B1 and B2. Standard Seed Mix 4 is recommended. Drill seeding is required.

189. Leave the disturbed area in a condition that provides drainage with no additional maintenance.

MIGRATORY BIRDS The project area is located in a narrow valley of mature basin big sagebrush. Understory development varies, but much of the herbaceous component is dominated by annual weeds. Adjacent slopes are composed predominantly of early-mature pinyon-juniper woodlands with a relatively open serviceberry-dominated shrub layer. A large array of migratory birds fulfills nesting functions in these higher elevation valley-slope interfaces during the months of May, June, and July. Species associated with these shrubland and woodland communities are typical and widely represented in the Resource Area and region. Those bird populations identified as having higher conservation interest (i.e., Rocky Mountain Bird Observatory, Partners in Flight program) are listed in the following table. Although the two sagebrush associates occur in these rank sagebrush habitats, these habitats are not favored and bird densities are low. These sites are more commonly occupied by blue-gray gnatcatcher and spotted towhee, with frequent foraging incursions by adjacent woodland and shrubland species (e.g., chipping sparrow, gray and dusky flycatcher). These lower woodland slopes were surveyed for evidence of raptor nest activity (e.g., accipitrine hawk), with no indications of past or recent raptor nest activity.

Birds with High Conservation Priority by Habitat Association

Sagebrush	Pinyon-juniper	Mountain shrub
Brewer's sparrow green-tailed towhee	gray flycatcher, pinyon jay, juniper titmouse, black-throat gray warbler, violet-green swallow	Virginia's warbler, green-tailed towhee

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: This construction activity may occur during the summer nesting months. Impacts to ongoing nest attempts would likely be limited to those directly involved with vegetation clearing and disruption of nest attempts in closer proximity to pipeline construction activity (e.g., within 50', or 5-10 acres of habitat). By shifting the right-of-way to a position that immediately parallels the west side of the existing access road (proposed mitigation, below), potential effects on breeding birds would be considerably reduced owing to the tendency for birds to avoid selection of nest sites in close proximity to existing forms of disturbance. By incorporating this mitigation, it is anticipated that few nest attempts of sagebrush associates and virtually none of adjacent woodland associates would be disrupted directly or indirectly by this action.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no potential disruption of bird nesting activities. Alternate routes or means of combining gas production cannot be analyzed.

Mitigation: The pipeline shall be installed immediately adjacent to the existing Brushy Point Draw road.

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

Affected Environment: There are no listed, proposed, or candidate animals known to inhabit or derive important benefit from the project area. Habitats associated with the project area have no known potential to be occupied by special status (including BLM sensitive) species.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There is virtually no potential for this action to have an influence on special status species or associated habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no potential for this action to have an influence on special status species or associated habitats. Alternate routes or means of combining gas production cannot be analyzed.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: Because these actions would have no conceivable influence on populations of, or habitats associated with special status species, neither would have a bearing on the appropriate standards for public land health.

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

Affected Environment: There are no threatened, endangered or sensitive plant species 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 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. Thus, there would be no effect on achieving the 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: 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: Proposed action is in Segment 23; the mainstream of East Douglas Creek and West Douglas Creek, including all tributaries, from their sources to their confluence. 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 proposed action 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.

Its designated beneficial uses are: Aquatic Life Cold 1, Recreation 1a, Water Supply 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 Brushy Point 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 will be promptly recontoured and revegetated using the recommended seed mix in the Soils 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: This valley supports an ephemeral channel that has been strongly modified by gas pad and stockpond development. The historic channel appears to have been narrowly incised 3-4 feet deep. The 26-2 location has blocked the channel and essentially acts as a dam with drainage apparently a lamellar flow across the pad. A large historic dam is situated immediately adjacent and upstream of the 26-1 location. This structure does not normally hold water, but has accumulated 8 or more feet of sediment, and forms a stable structure that, by raising the channel bed, has eliminated the channel incise for several hundred feet upstream. Most valley drainage appears to spread and infiltrate across the valley and, as evidenced by the strong perennial grass component, is apparently instrumental in increasing available soil moisture.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: As mapped (the project not flagged on 4/23/04), the route would intersect the existing incised channel one or more times, as well as the existing dam structure near the 26-1 location. Although the channel crossings do not elicit concern, the crossing(s) would complicate reclamation.

More importantly, cutting a trench through the existing dam or its stored sediments is considered an unnecessary risk to the long term stability of this valley. Because this structure likely stores a considerable quantity of alluvial water (at least seasonally), a trench-like feature would tend to act as a channel, accumulating and concentrating alluvial flows, and providing a means for water to pass through the structure (i.e., violating the integrity of the dam). In the event the integrity of the existing dam were breached, ensuing headcutting through many feet of stored sediments would eventually fill and fail a downstream stockpond and contribute large quantities of sediment to East Douglas Creek (a large perennial systems about 4 miles downstream). Excessive sediments contributed to this system would tend to destabilize lower East Douglas and middle portions of mainstem Douglas Creek by abbreviating the longevity and reducing the stability of its numerous beaver ponds, thereby prompting inappropriate rates of channel migration and incidents of channel downcutting and bank sloughing. By implementing BLM-proposed mitigation, disturbances to the channel and dam would be completely avoided.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no potential to disrupt channel banks or the integrity of the dam structure. Alternate routes or means of combining gas production cannot be analyzed.

Mitigation: The pipeline shall be installed immediately adjacent (i.e., within 35 feet of the westerly road edge) to the existing Brushy Point Draw road.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for riparian systems: This project would have no direct influence on riparian or wetland systems, however, the project as proposed poses a decided risk in disrupting valley stability and prompting large sediment deliveries to downstream perennial systems that are in proper functioning condition and meeting riparian land health standards. It is believed this risk would be avoided by minor adjustments to the right-of-way.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACEC's, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, Wilderness, 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 is in soil mapping unit #10; Blazon, moist-Rentsac complex, on 8 to 65 percent slopes. The Blazon soil is shallow and well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from shale. Typically, the upper part of the surface layer is brown channery loam about 4 inches thick. The lower part is brown channery clay loam

about 7 inches thick. The underlying material is light yellowish brown shale clay loam about 5 inches thick. Soft shale is at a depth of 16 inches. Depth to soft shale ranges from 10 to 20 inches. Permeability of the Blazon soil is moderately slow. Available water capacity is low. Effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very high. The Rentsac soil is shallow and well drained. It formed in residuum derived dominantly from sandstone. Typically, the surface layer is grayish brown channery loam about 5 inches thick. The next layer is brown very channery loam about 4 inches thick. The underlying material is very pale brown extremely flaggy loam about 7 inches thick. Hard sandstone is a depth of 16 inches. Depth to sandstone ranges from 10 to 20 inches. Permeability of the Rentsac soil is moderately rapid. Available water capacity is low. Effective rooting depth is 10 to 20 inches. Runoff is rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate to very high. No special designations have been assigned to this location. This map unit is a Pinyon-Juniper woodland range site.

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: Use standard seed mix #4.

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: The project area is a sagebrush/western wheatgrass bottom. Predominate species include; Wyoming big sagebrush, greasewood, western wheatgrass, and a variety of other forbs and grasses.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: There would be disturbance of the native plant community. Following completion of seeding this site would have a functional plant community within three years. Over time the adjacent native plant community would encroach onto the site and increase in dominance. The expected period for a native plant community to dominate the site is estimated at thirty years.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative:

Mitigation: None

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Following completion of reclamation soil stability

would be maintained and the conversion to a native plant community would be ongoing. This site would meet the public land standard for plant community health.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: East Douglas Creek, a larger perennial system about 4 miles downstream of the project site, is the nearest aquatic community. This drainage supports a well-developed willow and beaver-based aquatic community with a limited amount of waterfowl nesting, a simple non-game fishery (speckled dace), and other vertebrate (e.g., amphibian) and invertebrate forms..

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Downstream aquatic habitat is inextricably linked to East Douglas' riparian and wetland communities. See discussion in the riparian/wetland section above.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There would be no potential for proposed development to disrupt downstream aquatic habitats. Alternate routes or means of combining gas production cannot be analyzed.

Mitigation: Same as riparian/wetland section above.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): The public land health standards for aquatic wildlife communities would be affected in the same manner as that discussed in the riparian/wetland section above.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: The project area is used by big game (deer and elk) throughout the year, but these valleys are used most heavily during the fall/early winter and spring months as a source of herbaceous forage. These degraded bottoms tend to be inhabited by a relatively simple nongame mammal community composed of common and widely distributed generalists.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: As mitigated, installation of this pipeline would have no adverse influence on seasonal big game use. Construction during the summer months would avoid seasonal big game occupation. Although inconsequential in scale, reclamation applied to the right-of-way would increase the local availability of perennial grasses available for use by deer and elk. Increasing structure and foodstuff production associated with an increasing perennial component (associated with reclamation) would favor very localized increases in the abundance of small mammals, but the project is too diminutive to affect community composition.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Present uses and trends in habitat condition would continue. Very small scale improvements to annual-dominated understories associated with about 1.5 acres of reclamation would be foregone.

Mitigation: See riparian/wetland section.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): As modified by man-made structures, the valley between the 26-2 and 26-2 locations is actively aggrading. Taken as a whole, the valley’s herbaceous community is dominated by annual weeds, but by prolonging the availability of soil moisture for plant growth, these structures appear to be prompting increased expression of perennial grasses. Any action that would interrupt this trend would detract from meeting the public land health standard. Improving the density and frequency of perennial herbs as forage and cover for wildlife (i.e., maintaining the integrity of these structures through BLM-prescribed mitigation) would be consistent with meeting this public land health standard.

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	
Visual Resources			X
Wild Horses	X		

RANGELAND MANAGEMENT

Affected Environment: This project is within the East Douglas Creek allotment, which runs cattle on a year-round basis. The project site is used during the fall and late summer. On the proposed route is Brushy Point Retention Dam #0702. This retention dam was constructed for livestock water. This project is a cooperative project with the current grazing permittee. This pond is filled in with sediment and provides little utility as a livestock water source.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Without Mitigation the proposed pipeline would be allowed to breach this reservoir. This would damage the integrity of the

structure with an expected failure. The opportunity for cleaning of this pond for its intended use would be foregone.

With mitigation this pond would not be subject to damage by the pipeline. The grazing permittee would retain the opportunity to maintain this structure.

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

Mitigation: The reservoir and dam structure would be avoided. The pipeline permit holder will be required to repair any damage to the reservoir resulting from this action both directly and indirectly.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: This project is in a Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class 2 area. The objective of this class is to retain the existing characteristic landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. Management activities may be seen, but should not attract the attention of the casual observer. Any changes must repeat the basic elements of form, line, color, and texture found in the predominant natural features of the characteristic landscape.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The applicant has proposed to use small equipment which will minimize impacts. Re-vegetation on this project will also minimize visual impacts. Therefore; the standards for VRM Class 2 will be met.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

WILD HORSES

Affected Environment: Wild horses are not managed on the lands included in this environmental assessment.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: None

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None

Mitigation: None

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY: This action is consistent with the scope of impacts addressed in the White River ROD/RMP. The cumulative impacts of oil and gas activities are addressed in the White River ROD/RMP for each resource value that would be affected by the proposed action.

References cited

Burney, Michael S., Thomas J. Lennon and Charles W. Wheeler

1979 Archaeological Clearance Survey for Lateral A-12 (R/W 78513) and Associated Well Ties: Fuelco Federal 26-1 (R/W 78509), Fuelco Federal 26-2 (R/W 78510), Fuelco Marshal Winston 34-1 (R/W 78511), Fuelco Federal 35-2 (R/W 78536). Western Cultural Resource Management, Boulder, Colorado.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED: BLM Resource Specialists

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
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 Mgmt Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Mgmt Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Marty O'Mara	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Mgmt Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	ORP	Wilderness
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Soils
Robert Fowler	Forester	Vegetation
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Mgmt 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
Robert Fowler	Forester	Rangeland Management
Penny Brown	Realty Specialist	Realty Authorizations
Chris Ham	ORP	Recreation
Max McCoy	NRS	Visual Resources
Valerie Dobrich	NRS	Wild Horses

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

CO-110-2004-089-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 proposed action with the mitigation measures listed below.

MITIGATION MEASURES:

1. Use seed that is certified and free of noxious weeds. Seed certification tags must be submitted to the Area Manager.
2. Additional seed applications may be required to accommodate specific site conditions or if initial seed germination has failed.
3. Seed species used in reseeding disturbed areas will be based on the seed mixes identified in table B-1 and B-2 of the White River ROD/RMP. Standard Seed Mix 4 is recommended. Drill seeding is required.
4. Leave the disturbed area in a condition that provides drainage with no additional maintenance.
5. The new pipeline must be placed immediately adjacent to the existing Brushy Point Draw road (within 50 feet of the existing Northwest Pipeline centerline and on the westerly road edge).
6. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by this project.
7. The reservoir and dam structure would be avoided. The pipeline permit holder will be required to repair any damage to the reservoir resulting from this action both directly and indirectly.
8. The new pipeline must be placed adjacent to the existing access road up Brushy Point Draw, within 50 feet of the existing Northwest Pipeline centerline on the westerly road edge.
9. 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.

10. 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.

11. Through the use of BMPs, keep sediment from leaving the proposed site. All disturbed areas will be promptly recontoured and revegetated using the recommended seed mix.

COMPLIANCE/MONITORING: Compliance will be conducted by the realty staff every five years.

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny Brown

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Caroline P. Howard 5/11/04

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: Thant E. Walter 5/12/04
Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

ATTACHMENTS: Map of the Location of the Proposed Action.

Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2004-089-EA

