

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

NUMBER: CO-110-2004-123-EA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC67666

PROJECT NAME: Scandard Draw Access Road

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado

T. 2 S., R. 96 W.,
Sec. 18, lot 6-8, 10, 11;
Sec. 19, lot 1-3.

T. 2 S., R. 97 W.,
Sec. 36, lot 2, 3, 8, 9.

T. 3 S., R. 97 W.,
Sec. 1, lot 4, $W\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 12, $NE\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 13, $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 24, $NE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 25, $E\frac{1}{2}E\frac{1}{2}$;
Sec. 36, $N\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SE\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$.

T. 4 S., R. 97 W.,
Sec. 1, lot 3, 4, $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 2, $SE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 11, $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 14, $E\frac{1}{2}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NW\frac{1}{4}$, $NW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 15, $E\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 22, $E\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $W\frac{1}{2}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 27, $W\frac{1}{2}NE\frac{1}{4}$, $E\frac{1}{2}SW\frac{1}{4}$, $NE\frac{1}{4}SE\frac{1}{4}$;
Sec. 34, $E\frac{1}{2}W\frac{1}{2}$, $SW\frac{1}{4}SW\frac{1}{4}$.

APPLICANT: Williams Production RMT Company

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional):

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES:

Background/Introduction: Williams Production RMT Company has applied for a right-of-way for the use of the Scandard Draw road.

Proposed Action: The proposed action is for the use of an existing road (Scandard Draw) for access to federal and private oil and gas leases held by Williams Production RMT Company (Williams). This road connects to an existing right-of-way (COC38510, Grand Junction Field Office) that proceeds down the south through Logan Wash. The existing road is in good condition and will not require any new construction. Seasonal maintenance is expected which includes dust control and gravel in low spots as needed. The road will be used year around via snow machine or ATV when possible. The right-of-way length is approximately 84,480 feet (16 miles), with a width of 30 feet encompassing 58.18 acres more or less.

This right-of-way will be authorized pursuant to Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976. The term of the right-of-way will be for 30 years.

No Action Alternative: Under the no action alternative the application would be denied and a different access route would have to be utilized.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT NOT CARRIED FORWARD:

NEED FOR THE ACTION: Williams has applied for a right-of-way for access using the Scandard Draw road for their proposed development of oil and gas in the area.

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. During periods of low precipitation, air quality in the area of the proposed action is often diminished by dust caused by human disturbance.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: The proposed right-of-way would result in short term, local impacts to air quality due to dust being blown into the air from an increase in vehicle traffic.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No increase in dust will occur.

Mitigation: Mitigation for dust abatement is addressed in the proposed action. No additional mitigation is necessary.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Affected Environment: With the exception of the road segment in sections 13 S½, 24 and 25 N½, Township 3 South, Range 97 West, the entire right of way has been inventoried at the Class III (100% pedestrian) level (Grand River Institute 1980, Jennings 1974, Kainer 1977, Singleton 1984) with no cultural resources identified in the areas inventoried.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It does not appear that the proposed Right-of-Way will impact any known cultural resources.

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

Mitigation: 1. There shall be no new construction or disturbance permitted outside the existing disturbance as it existed as of May 1, 2004. 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 principal noxious and problem weeds of concern along this road right of way are mullein, houndstongue, black henbane, and spotted knapweed and musk thistle.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Earthen disturbance created by maintenance of this right of way could create safe sites for the establishment of noxious and invasive species. If mitigation is applied as recommended, there will be no significant negative impact.

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

Mitigation: The holder of this right of way will be required to eradicate all noxious/problem weeds and invasive species using materials and methods approved by the authorized officer.

MIGRATORY BIRDS

Affected Environment: There is a large array of migratory birds that fulfill breeding functions in adjacent pinyon-juniper woodland, upland big sagebrush, and mixed mountain shrub communities during the months of May, June, and July.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: This road is an established access for a number of companies to higher elevation natural gas activity in Piceance Basin. Authorizing use to another company would have virtually no influence on the utility or condition of adjacent habitats for breeding bird use.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts of denying use to this operator would have no measurable influence on current road activities influence on migratory bird nest functions in adjacent habitats.

Mitigation: none

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

Affected Environment: Sage grouse occupy higher elevation sagebrush ranges across the Piceance Basin and Roan Plateau. Similar to many populations throughout the west, this population has undergone dramatic decline over the last 20 years. Suggested reasons for these birds' decline are varied, but no definitive issues have been established for this population of birds. This road is situated on a narrow sagebrush ridgeline that once supported a northern sage grouse strutting ground. This lek is not known to have been used in over 10 years. Birds normally attend these sites from March through May. Although the nearest active leks are somewhat distant (about 3.5 miles) it is likely that limited nesting functions (April through mid-July) continue to be fulfilled in suitable sagebrush habitats throughout the project area.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: At the present time and under suppressed population regimes, it is highly unlikely that road use attributable to another company would further degrade the utility of this ridgeline for sage grouse strutting and nesting use. However, in the event sage grouse populations rebound, persistent and frequent road use by vehicles associated with natural gas development would likely disallow subsequent reoccupation of this ridgeline by former numbers of sage grouse use and contribute to a reduction in the usable habitat base available for population recovery.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Same as proposed action.

Mitigation: A WRFO wildlife biologist and CDOW habitat biologist spoke with representatives from Williams earlier this year and related the agencies' concerns with seasonal road use relative to sage grouse lek and nesting functions. The agency biologists and Williams representatives agreed to begin dialogue to determine practical travel alternatives (e.g., the Stewart Gulches) that would help minimize vehicle-related impacts on future sage grouse nest and lek functions in Scandard and Stewart Gulches.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for Threatened & Endangered species: The public land health standard for northern sage grouse, a BLM sensitive species, is not currently being met in this area or across Piceance Basin (see affected environment) due to a markedly reduced population and declining population trend. Although much of the sage grouse habitat in Piceance Basin is privately owned, CDOW and BLM are accelerating efforts to restore suitability to those sagebrush habitats in advanced successional states and, in cooperation with gas development companies, seeking means to maintain the utility of Piceance Basin's naturally fragmented habitats in the face of intensive natural gas development. Effort between Williams and the BLM and CDOW contribute toward the meeting of the public land health standards in the long term.

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: The access road is primarily in the Willow Creek and Scandard Gulch drainages and are tributary to Piceance Creek and the White River. Water quality data is not available for these drainages. These segments of stream are considered to be ephemeral drainages which flow in direct response to winter snow melt and late summer/fall rainstorms. Water quality of precipitation is considered to be of good quality, but can be high is sediment depending on the magnitude and duration of the storm event.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Impacts to water quality from permitting the access route would be the same as they are presently. Roads are a large contributor to suspended sediment discharge from water running off of roads. This impact would continue until successful reclamation has occurred.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts are not expected from the no-action alternative.

Mitigation: Use Condition of Approval (#42 & 43) in Appendix B of the WRRMP to help control suspended sediment discharge and erosion that is associated with roads.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for water quality: Water Quality in the project area currently meets the Standard and would be expected to continue to meet the Standard in the future with implementation of the proposed action.

CRITICAL ELEMENTS NOT PRESENT OR NOT AFFECTED:

No ACECs, flood plains, prime and unique farmlands, wilderness, wetlands and riparian zones, 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: Baseline soils data have been collected for Rio Blanco and Garfield Counties by the NRCS and are published in order III Soil Surveys. These surveys are available for review from the White River Field Office. The table below identifies soil characteristics for the soils encountered from the proposed action

Soil Number	Soil Name	Soil pH	Permeability	Water Capacity	Runoff	Erosion Potential	Range site	Slope
6	Barcus channery loamy sand	7.9-8.4	6.0-20	0.06-0.10	Slow	Moderate	Foothills Swale	2-8%
15	Castner channery loam	6.6-7.8	0.6-6.0	0.12-0.16	Medium to rapid	Moderate to very high	Pinyon-Juniper woodlands	5-50%
33	Forelle loam	6.6-9.0	0.06-0.2	0.16-0.18	Medium	Moderate	Rolling Loam	3-8%
36	Glendive fine sandy loam	7.4-9.0	2.0-6.0	0.12-0.18	Slow	Slight	Foothills Swale	
43	Irigul-Parachute complex	7.4-7.8	0.6-2.0	0.09-0.11	Rapid	Slight to high	Loamy Slopes/Mountain Loam	12-45% 5-30%
50	Lamphier-Tampico-Kamak loams	6.1-7.3	0.6-2.0	0.18-0.21	Medium	High	Aspen woodlands/Brushy Loam	5-60%
52	Miracle fine sandy loam	6.6-7.3	2.0-6.0	0.12-0.15	Medium	Slight to very high	Mountain Loam	3-25%
55	Nihill channery sandy loam	7.4-8.4	2.0-6.0	0.10-0.12	Medium	Moderate to very high	Salt-desert Breaks	5-50%
56	Northwater loam	6.6-7.8	0.6-2.0	0.13-0.18	Medium	Moderate to very high	Aspen Woodlands	5-50%
58	Parachute Loam	6.6-7.8	0.6-2.0	0.16-0.18	Medium	Very high	Brushy Loam	25-75%
63	Patent loam	7.4-8.4	0.6-2.0	0.20-0.22	Rapid	High	Rolling Loam	15-25%
64	Piceance fine sandy loam	7.4-8.4	2.0-6.0	0.13-0.15	Medium	Moderate to high	Rolling Loam	5-15%
65	Pinelli clay loam	6.6-7.8	0.2-0.6	0.17-0.19	Medium to rapid	Moderate to high	Clayey Foothills	3-12%
66	Potts-Begay fine sandy loams	7.4-8.4	2.0-6.0	0.11-0.13	Medium	Moderate	Loamy Salt-desert/Sandy Salt-desert	2-7%
70	Redcreek-Rentsac complex	7.4-8.4	2.0-6.0	0.12-0.16	Very high	Moderate to high	PJ woodlands/PJ woodlands	5-30%
73	Rentsac channery loam	6.6-8.4	2.0-6.0	0.12-0.16	Rapid	Moderate to very high	Pinyon-Juniper woodlands	5-50%
87	Starman-Vandamore complex	7.9-9.0	0.6-2.0	0.09-0.11	Medium	Moderate to very high	Dry Exposure/Dry Exposure	5-40%
91	Torriorthents-Rock Outcrop complex				Rapid	Very high	Stoney Foothills	15-90%

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Impacts would be similar to any surface disturbing action. Generally, when gypsum crystals are present, then soil piping can become a problem. It is important to keep water off of the road surface with water spreaders and possible check dams.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Impacts are not anticipated if the proposed action were not permitted.

Mitigation: Use of Road Construction and Maintenance, Conditions of Approval (BMP's) #42 and 43, found in Appendix B of the WRRMP need to be used to ensure the road is constructed and maintained properly and that sediment and salts are contained on site.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for upland soils: Soils in the project area meet the Standard and would be expected to continue to meet the Standard in the future with implementation of the proposed action.

VEGETATION (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: Vegetation in the project area is primarily mixed Pinyon- Juniper /wyoming big sagebrush at lower elevations and mountain shrub/mountain big sagebrush at higher elevations with a diverse undersory of grasses and forbs

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Authorization of this right of way will create no additional earthen disturbance. The existing road and borrow area is well vegetated.

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

Mitigation: It is recommended that the grant include a stipulation that no blading of the borrow area of the road will be permitted without specific authorization by the Authorized Officer. In addition, the Authorized Officer may direct the grant holder to water or surface the road for dust abatement. Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas with Native Seed mixture #3 and eradicate all noxious/problem weeds and invasive species which occur on this right of way.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Wildlife, Aquatic and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Upland plant communities in the project area meet the Standard and would be expected to meet the Standard in the future with implementation of the proposed action and applied mitigation.

WILDLIFE, AQUATIC (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: There are no aquatic habitats potentially influenced by this existing road.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: No impacts.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: No impacts.

Mitigation: None.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Terrestrial): Because the proposed action has no potential to influence the function or condition of aquatic habitats, a discussion of the public land health standard is not relevant.

WILDLIFE, TERRESTRIAL (includes a finding on Standard 3)

Affected Environment: This privately controlled access intersects a wide range of seasonal wildlife ranges, including critical mule deer habitats as severe winter range and summer range.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: This road is a long-established access for a number of companies to higher elevation natural gas activity in Piceance Basin and the Roan Plateau. Authorizing use to another company would have virtually no influence on the utility or condition of adjacent wildlife habitats.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: Same as the proposed action.

Mitigation: None, but see discussion in threatened and endangered species.

Finding on the Public Land Health Standard for plant and animal communities (partial, see also Vegetation and Wildlife, Aquatic): The public land health standard for animal communities is broadly met across Piceance Basin for most terrestrial wildlife groups. Authorizing road use to another company would have little further influence on the intensity or frequency of vehicle use and its effect on adjacent wildlife habitat values. This project would not detract from continued meeting of the standard.

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

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

Non-Critical Element	NA or Not Present	Applicable or Present, No Impact	Applicable & Present and Brought Forward for Analysis
Socio-Economics		X	
Visual Resources		X	
Wild Horses	X		

ACCESS AND TRANSPORTATION

Affected Environment: BLM road 1009A would be affected.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: An increase of all-season traffic would be expected.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: None.

Mitigation: None.

PALEONTOLOGY

Affected Environment: The proposed right-of-way is located in an area mapped as the Uinta Formation (Tweto 1979), which the BLM has classified as a Category I formation, meaning it is a known producer of scientifically important fossil resources.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: It is not anticipated that scientifically important fossils will be impacted unless it becomes necessary to excavate into the underlying bedrock formation for maintenance purposed.

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 occurs within the MTW use area of the Piceance Mountain (06023) allotment. This allotment is used annually by MTW ranch as part of its year round cattle operation from May 1 through the end of November.

Environmental Consequences of the Proposed Action: Because the amount of use/traffic has not been quantified it is difficult to accurately assess the impact of implementing the

proposed action. With frequent use by heavy trucks, fugitive dust will be a problem both in terms of damage to the vegetation and its availability as forage for livestock.

Environmental Consequences of the No Action Alternative: There will be no change from the present situation of relatively infrequent and low impact use.

Mitigation: The holder will maintain the integrity of pasture fences within the allotment by installing/replacing cattleguards where necessary so that these cattleguards are sufficient for the traffic type and load. The authorized officer may direct the holder to initiate dust abatement measures including but not limited to watering, road surfacing with magnesium chloride.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY:

REFERENCES CITED

Grand River Institute

- 1980 Cultural Resource Inventory Report on Approximately Fourteen Miles of the Proposed DeBeque Pipeline Project #80-08 for Rocky Mountain Natural Gas Co., Inc. Grand River Institute, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Jennings, Calvin H.

- 1974 Letter Report to Ms. Carol Hopkins, Atlantic Richfield Company Re: Access Road from Rio Blanco County Road 5 to CB-1 core hole. Laboratory of Public Archaeology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Kainer, Ronald E.

- 1977 Negative Results Report for Proposed Access Road: Right-of-Way C15827. Prepared for Atlantic Richfield Company. Laboratory of Public Archaeology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Singleton, Steve

- 1984 Report of Examination for Cultural Resources: Scandard Ridge Road Maintenance. White River Resource Area, Bureau of Land Management, Meeker, Colorado

Tweto, Ogden

- 1978 Geologic Map of Colorado. United States Geologic Survey, Department of the Interior, Reston, Virginia.

PERSONS / AGENCIES CONSULTED:

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
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-Native Species
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Migratory Birds
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Animal Species, Wildlife
Marty O'Mara	Hazmat Collateral	Wastes, Hazardous or Solid
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Water Quality, Surface and Ground Hydrology and Water Rights
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands and Riparian Zones
Chris Ham	ORP	Wilderness
Caroline Hollowed	Hydrologist	Soils
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	Vegetation
Ed Hollowed	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife Terrestrial and Aquatic
Chris Ham	ORP	Access and Transportation
Ken Holsinger	NRS	Fire Management
Robert Fowler	Forester	Forest Management
Paul Daggett	Mining Engineer	Geology and Minerals
Mark Hafkenschiel	Rangeland Management Specialist	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-110-2004-123-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. There shall be no new construction or disturbance permitted outside the existing disturbance as it existed as of May 1, 2004. 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.

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. The holder of this right of way will be required to eradicate all noxious/problem weeds and invasive species using materials and methods approved by the authorized officer.
4. A WRFO wildlife biologist and CDOW habitat biologist spoke with representatives from Williams earlier this year and related the agencies' concerns with seasonal road use relative to sage grouse lek and nesting functions. The agency biologists and Williams representatives agreed to begin dialogue to determine practical travel alternatives (e.g., the Stewart Gulches) that would help minimize vehicle-related impacts on future sage grouse nest and lek functions in Scandard and Stewart Gulches.
5. The operator shall be required to collect and properly dispose of any solid wastes generated by this project.
6. Use Condition of Approval (#42 & 43) in Appendix B of the WR RMP to help control suspended sediment discharge and erosion that is associated with roads.
7. Use of Road Construction and Maintenance, Conditions of Approval (BMPs) #42 and 43, found in Appendix B of the WR RMP need to be used to ensure the road is constructed and maintained properly and that sediment and salts are contained on site.
8. It is recommended that the grant include a stipulation that no blading of the borrow area of the road will be permitted without specific authorization by the Authorized Officer. In addition, the Authorized Officer may direct the grant holder to water or surface the road for dust abatement. Promptly revegetate all disturbed areas with Native Seed mixture #3 and eradicate all noxious/problem weeds and invasive species which occur on this right of way.
9. 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.
10. The holder will maintain the integrity of pasture fences within the allotment by installing/replacing cattleguards where necessary so that these cattleguards are sufficient for the traffic type and load. The authorized officer may direct the holder to initiate dust abatement measures including but not limited to watering, road surfacing with magnesium chloride.
11. Maintenance should be performed to conserve existing surface material, retain the original crowned or outsloped self-draining cross section, prevent or remove rutting berms (except those designed for slope protection) and other irregularities that retard normal surface runoff. Avoid wasting loose ditch or surface material over the shoulder where it can cause stream sedimentation or weaken slump-prone areas. Avoid undercutting backslopes (#42).
12. Promptly remove slide material when it is obstructing road surface and ditchline drainage. Save all soil or material useable for reclamation and stockpile for future reclamation needs. Use remaining slide material for needed road improvement or place in a stable waste area. Avoid

sidecasting of slide material where it can damage, overload, saturate embankments, or flow into downslope drainage courses. Reestablish vegetation in areas where more than 50 percent of vegetation has been destroyed due to sidecasting (#43).

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

NAME OF PREPARER: Penny G Brown 07/16/04

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Caroline P. Holloway 7/16/04

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:


Acting Field Manager

DATE SIGNED: 7/16/04

ATTACHMENTS: Map of the location of proposed action.

Location of Proposed Action CO-110-2004-123-EA

