BLM

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore, LP Proposal to Install a 4 Inch Surface Pipeline from the NBU 206–9 Well Pad to an existing surface pipeline near the NBU 431–09E Well Pad Greater Natural Buttes Unit, Uintah County, Utah

January 2014

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029-EA

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore, LP
Proposal to Install a 4 Inch Surface Pipeline from the NBU 206–9 Well Pad to an existing surface pipeline near the NBU 431–09E Well Pad
Greater Natural Buttes Unit, Uintah County, Utah
January 2014

Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Finding of No Significant Impact

Finding of No Significant Impact:

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014–0029–EA, I have determined that the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement is not required.

Signatures:

Recommended by: 1/27/2014

Tyler Cox [Date]
Natural Resource Specialist

Approved by: JAN 3 1 2014

Authorized Officer [Date]
AFM for Minerals

Decision Record - Memorandum

Selected Action:

It is my decision to approve Kerr McGee Oil & Gas LLP proposal to install 1025 feet of 4 inch surface pipeline in Section 9, T. 10 S., R. 21 E., Uintah County, Utah. The project area is located approximately 33 miles south of Vernal, Utah. The pipeline will be constructed as described in the proposed action alternative of DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0029–EA. This decision is subject to the below conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval:

This decision is contingent on meeting all stipulations and monitoring requirements listed below, which were designed to minimize and/or avoid impacts.

- KMG will comply with all COAs in the Vegetation section from Appendix B, Table B-2, of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).
- KMG will comply with all COAs in the Paleontology section from Appendix B, Table B-2, of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).
- A paleontology monitor is required during any ground disturbing activities.
- If, during operations, any paleontological resources as described in BLM H-8270–1 are discovered, all operations which would affect such sites will be suspended and the discovery reported promptly to the surface management agency.

Rationale:

The subject lands were leased for oil or gas development under authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as modified by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, and the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act of 1987. The lessee/operator has the right to explore for oil and gas on the lease as specified in 43 CFR 3103.1-2, and if a discovery is made, to produce oil and/or natural gas for economic gain.

The selected alternative meets the BLM's need to acknowledge and allow development of valid existing leases. The BLM objective to reduce impacts is met by the imposing of mitigation measures to protect other resource values.

Land Use Plan Conformance:

The selected alternative is in conformance with the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (BLM 2008).

The selected alternative is consistent with *Uintah County General Plan* (published in 2007) that encompasses the location of the proposed wells. In general, the plan indicates support for development proposals such as the selected alternative through the plan's emphasis of multiple-use public land management practices, responsible use and optimum utilization.

Chapter 1. Introduction and Need for Proposed Action

1.1. Introduction:

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to analyze the potential impacts of the Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP (KMG) surface pipeline project connected to the existing well pad NBU 206–9. KMG proposes to install one 4–inch surface gas pipeline in section 9 T10S R21E SLB Meridian, Uintah County, UT. This EA is a site-specific analysis of the potential impacts that would result from the implementation of the proposed action. This analysis is tiered to the Greater Natural Buttes (GNB) Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (BLM2012a).

1.1.1. Title, EA number, and type of project:

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP, proposes to instal a 4–inch surface pipeline from the NBU 206–9 well pad to an existing 4–inch gas pipeline.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2014–0029–EA

1.1.2. Location of Proposed Action:

Project is located approximately 34 miles South of Vernal, UT. It is located in Uintah County, UT. Section 9 T10S R21E.

1.1.3. Name and Location of Preparing Office:

Lead Office - Vernal Field Office

170 South 500 East

Vernal, UT 84078

1.1.4. Applicant Name:

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas LP

PO Box 173779

Denver, CO 80217

1.2. Purpose and Need for Action:

The BLM's purpose is to respond to the application to install a surface pipeline to facilitate KMG's development of existing federal oil and gas leases in order to meet demands for domestic oil and natural gas while preventing unnecessary or undue degradation to BLM public lands. The proposed pipeline would allow KMG to utilize existing least rights to drill for, extract, remove, and market commercial quantities of oil and natural gas. The Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA), as amended, and the regulations and policies by which it is implemented, recognize the right of the lease holders to develop federal mineral resources to meet continuing needs and economic demands, so long as unnecessary or undue degradation is not incurred.

produce funding for the state school system, and because production on federal leases could lead to further interest in drilling on state leases in the area, it is assumed that the alternatives analyzed, except the No Action Alternative, are consistent with the objectives of the state.

1.5. Identification of Issues:

BLM reviewed KMG's proposed activities to assess the type and magnitude of potential impacts to resources and resource uses on BLM-administrated land. A list of all resources considered is contained in Appendix A, Interdisciplinary (ID) Team Checklist. The "Potentially Impacted (PI) resources, as identified by the BLM , are listed below with issue statements describing the potential impact. These resources are carried forward for description in the Affected Environment section (Chapter 3) and analysis in the Environmental Impacts section (Chapter 4) of this EA. Resources that the BLM identified as "Not Impacted" (NI) by the Proposed Action or "Not Present" (NP) in the Project Area, as identified in the ID Team Checklist, were not carried forward for detailed analysis.

1.5.1. Invasive Plant/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation:

Issue 1: Surface disturbance from installation of surface pipelines would result in the disturbance of soils and vegetation on up to 0.15 BLM-administered land and would increase the potential for invasive plant or noxious weed establishment or expansion.

1.5.2. Paleontology

Issue 1: No scientifically important fossils were found. However, there is a high potential that important fossils will be unearthed during construction.

1.5.3. Wildlife: Migratory Birds Including Raptors

Issue 1: Migratory birds found in the area, with up to 0.15 acres of surface disturbance.

Chapter 2. Description of Alternatives

2.1. Introduction:

This chapter provides a description of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative. No additional action alternatives have been identified. The No Action Alternative is considered and analyzed to provide a baseline for comparison of the impacts of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action integrates the terms and conditions in the GNB ROD (BlM 2012b).

2.2. Proposed Action:

KMG proposes to install one 4–inch surface gas pipeline. The pipeline would extend from the NBU 206–9 well pad to an existing 4–inch surface pipeline along the NBU 431–09E well pad. KMG would own and operate this pipeline. The proposed pipeline is all on lease, and a right-of-way would not be required. The entire pipeline is approximately 1,025 feet in length. Approximately 625 feet of the pipeline route follows the roadway. The other approximately 400 feet go cross country between two roads. The pipeline would be built on the roadway and lifted onto the side of the road for the sections of the route that parallel the road. For the cross country sections, the pipeline would be built on a pad, then pulled across country. Pipeline construction should not need the clearing of vegetation. Surface disturbance is not anticipated to be needed, but a 15 foot width cross country path will be analyzed for emergency during construction, if a piece of equipment needs to be driven cross country. That would amount to 0.15 acres of potential disturbance. All of that potential disturbance would be on BLM-administered lands.

2.2.1. Pipeline Construction:

The gas gathering pipelines would be made of steel with fusion bond epoxy coating (or equivalent). The road or well pad would be utilized for pipeline construction and staging. For safe operation, the pipeline would be designed to operate at a maximum allowable operating pressure of 720 to 740 pounds per square inch gauge (PSIG). Normal operating pressures would range between 50 to 150 PSIG. The proposed pipeline would be pneumatically tested before being placed into service. In no case would pressure testing of the pipelines result in discharge of liquids on the ground surface. All above ground facilities/structures would be painted Shadow Gray to match the surrounding landscape. KMG would install pipeline signs along the route to indicate the pipelines' proximity and ownership and to provide emergency contact phone numbers. The pipelines would likely remain in place for a term of 30 years, or so long as needed to collect and transport natural gas and liquids from the Natural Buttes Field.

2.2.2. Noxious Weeds

KMG would control noxious weeds as needed during the life of the gas pipeline. According to the Anadarko Integrated Weed Management Plan, KMG would complete monitoring and management of noxious and invasive weeds of concern annually until reclamation is successful. KMG would map noxious weed infestations on BLM-administered land using a Global Positioning System (GPS) unit and submit the data to the BLM with information required in the Vernal BLM Surface Disturbance Weed Policy (BLM 2009). Two patches of saltcedar (*Tamarix Sp.*), a State of Utah List C noxious weed, were identified in the vicinity of the proposed project, including one patch adjacent to the proposed pipeline.

Chapter 3. Affected Environment:

The affected environment of the Project Area was evaluated by a BLM Interdisciplinary (ID) team, as documented in the ID Team Checklist (Appendix A). The checklist indicates which resources of concern are present, which resources would be affected by the alternatives and require analysis in the EA, and which resources are either not present in the Project Area or would not be affected to a degree that requires detailed analysis. The description of the affected environment in this section focuses on those resources identified as "PI" (present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA) in the IDTeam Checklist (Appendix A).

The proposed surface pipeline would be located in the Natural Buttes Unit on BLM-administered lands in the BLM Utah Vernal Field Office (Map 1). Mineral extraction activities, livestock grazing, and associated surface disturbance have historically affected the Project Area. This EA is tiered to the GNB Record of Decision (BLM 2012b) and incorporates the GNB Final EIS(BLM 2012a) by reference; as a result, this chapter summarizes and cites the affected environment description from the GNB Final EIS(BLM 2012a) and provides additional site-specific information, where appropriate.

3.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

3.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds and Vegetation

Vegetation in the Project Area vicinity consists predominantly of a mixed desert shrub community. Table 3.1, "Plant Species Observed in the Project Area" (p. 11) identifies common plant species which occur within or near the Project Area. Refer to Section 3.4 for additional information on federal, state, and local listed plant species that occur within the Project Area.

Table 3.1. Plant Species Observed in the Project Area

Scientific Name	Common Name
Shrubs	
Atriplex canescens	Four-winged saltbush
Atriplex confertifolia	Shadscale
Atriplex corrugata	Mat saltbush
Atriplex gardneri	Gardner's saltbush
Artemisia spp.	Sagebrush species
Ceratoides lanata	Winterfat
Chrysothamnus spp.	Rabbitbrush species
Ephedra torreyana	Mormon tea
Sarcobatus vermiculatus	Greasewood
Tetradymia spinosa	Horsebrush
Cacti	
Opuntia sp.	Prickly pear cactus
Pediocactus simpsonii	Mountain Ball Cactus
Grasses and Forbs	
Agropyron dasystachyum var. dasystachyum	Thickspike wheatgrass
Allium textile	Textile onion
Arenaria spp.	Sandwort
Cleome lutea	Yellow beeplant
Cymopterus spp.	Spring parsley
Eriogonum inflatum	Desert trumpet
Descurainia pinnata	Tansy mustard
Hilaria jamesii	Galleta

Pinion ~Juniper/Desert Shrub Habitats: bald eagle, black-chinned hummingbird, broad-tailed hummingbird, Brewer's sparrow, burrowing owl, Cassin's finch, Cassin's kingbird, gray flycatcher, gray vireo, grasshopper sparrow, greater sage-grouse, green-tailed towhee, juniper titmouse, mountain bluebird, sage sparrow, sage thrasher, and Virginia's warbler. (Parrish et al. 2002)

Chapter 4. Environmental Impacts:

The analysis in this chapter is tiered to the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b), incorporates by reference the analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a), and provides additional site-specific analysis and information, where appropriate, to inform decision-making on this specific development proposal. Environmental impacts are only discussed for resources identified as "PI" (present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA) in the ID Team Checklist (Appendix A).

4.1. Proposed Action Environmental Impacts

This section analyzes the impacts of the Proposed Action on the potentially impacted resources described in the affected environment chapter (Chapter 3).

4.1.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

4.1.1.1. Plant Species, Excluding U.S. Fish and Wildlife Designated Species, and Invasive Plants/Noxious Weed Species

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 0.15 acres of vegetation habitat, primarily in mixed desert shrub communities. Direct impacts to vegetation would be possible from cross country driving along the pipeline route and degradation of habitat through soil compaction. Indirect impacts to vegetation resources may include the invasion and establishment of introduced, undesired plant species. The severity of these invasions would depend on the success of reclamation and revegetation and the degree and success of noxious weed control efforts. Refer to Section 4.11.3 (page 4-114) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on potential impacts to vegetation.

To minimize potential impacts to vegetation, KMG has committed to the COAs for Vegetation, Vegetation: Weed Management, and Reclamation Plan from the GNB ROD Appendix B, Table B-2 (BLM 2012b), and the Green River District Reclamation Guidelines (BLM 2011).

Mitigation Measures for Vegetation and Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds

This EA is tiered to and incorporates the COAs and mitigation measures included in Appendix B of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). No additional mitigation measures were identified for vegetation during preparation of this EA.

4.1.1.2. Soils

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 0.15 acres of soils, primarily in high constraint soils. High constraint soils pose limitations to successful implementation of reclamation measures and long-term maintenance of protective and productive vegetative cover.

Potential direct impacts to 0.15 aces of soil include mixing of soil horizons, soil compaction, short-term loss of topsoil and site productivity, contamination of soils with petroleum products, loss of soil/topsoil through wind and water erosion, and vegetation loss. Loss of soil/topsoil in disturbed areas would increase competition by annual weed species with native species. Annual weed species are adapted to disturbed conditions, and have less stringent moisture and soil nutrient requirements than do perennial native species. Refer to Section 4.9.3 (pages 4-93 through 4-94) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on potential impacts to soils.

during the spring or summer months it could cause birds to move into other adjacent habitats or into habitats where inter-specific and intra-specific competition between species may increase. Noise disturbance associated with project activities would be considered temporary and is anticipated to occur during typical working hours.

Mitigation Measures for Migratory Birds (including raptors)

No additional mitigation measures were identified for migratory birds during preparation of this EA.

4.2. No Action Alternative Environmental Impacts

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts from the Proposed Action as the proposed development would be denied. Under the No Action Alternative, currently approved oil and gas development and other activities in the Project Area would continue. Development of 12 existing wells and associated infrastructure in the Project Area has resulted in approximately 53.80 acres of surface disturbance. Refer to ??? for additional information on existing wells and surface disturbance in the Project Area and associated surface disturbance.

4.2.1. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Under the No Action Alternative, KMG would not develop the proposed gas wells or develop the associated pipelines and infrastructure. The 12 existing wells in the Project Area would continue to produce emissions until they are plugged. Refer to Section 4.1.1 (pages 4-6 through 4-10) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on potential air quality impacts under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.2. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no direct disturbance or indirect effects to soil and vegetation from surface-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action. Refer to Section 4.9.1 (pages 4–89 through 4–91) and Section 4.11.1 (pages 4–100 through 4–104) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on soils and vegetation impacts under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.3. Paleontology

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no direct or indirect disturbance to paleontological resources from surface-disturbing activities associated with the Proposed Action. Refer to Section 4.5.1 (page 4-138) of the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for more information on impacts to paleontological resources under the No Action Alternative.

4.2.4. Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)

Under the No Action Alternative, the BLM would not approve the surface pipeline. There would be no direct or indirect effects to migratory birds, including raptors. Current land use trends in the area would continue of which would mainly include increased oil and gas development activities. Refer to Section 4.15.1.1 (pages 4-136 through 4-139) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM

Chapter 5. Reasonably Foreseeable Development and Cumulative Impacts:

Cumulative impacts are those impacts that result from the incremental impact of each alternative when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, regardless of which agency or person undertakes such other actions. Each section below identifies the Cumulative Impact Analysis Areas (CIAAs) for individual resources and resource issues and the rationale for the selection of each area.

5.1. Cumulative Impacts

Proposed drilling, surface disturbance, and other activities under the Proposed Action (as described in Chapter 2 of this EA) are within the bounds of the cumulative impact analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a). The GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) identified past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development and analyzed cumulative impacts to resources and resource uses from the drilling and development of oil and gas resources in the GNBPA. As a result, the cumulative impact analysis in this chapter tiers to and incorporates by reference the analysis in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a). The analysis in this chapter provides additional site-specific analysis and information, where appropriate, to inform decision-making on this specific development proposal.

5.2. Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Development

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future development in the GNBPA primarily includes oil and gas development, but it also includes oil shale; gilsonite; tar sands; sand and gravel; activities associated with recreation, livestock grazing, vegetative treatments, and infrastructure improvements; and other projects. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future oil and gas development in the GNBPA has resulted and will continue to result in approximately 26,093 acres of surface disturbance. Refer to Section 5.2 (pages 5–1 through 5–12) in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) for additional information on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable development.

5.2.1. Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation

The CIAA for soils, vegetation, and invasive plants/noxious weeds is the GNBPA. Cumulative impacts are primarily attributable to oil and gas development and vegetation management by various federal agencies. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions would cumulatively and incrementally affect erosion and sedimentation rates within this area, current land uses, revegetation and reclamation success, soil productivity, and the potential introduction and/or spread of noxious weeds and invasive species. Surface-disturbing activity that removes native vegetation and topsoil from the CIAA may cumulatively and incrementally affect general vegetation by fragmenting plant communities and increasing competition with invasive and noxious weeds. Surface-disturbing activities that compact soil, increase erosion and sediment yield, and increase fugitive dust may also cumulatively and incrementally affect general vegetation, as such changes to the landscape may decrease plant productivity and composition in the CIAA.

The past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future total area of disturbance due to oil and gas activity in the CIAA is estimated at 26,093 acres (BLM 2012a), which includes the estimated disturbance from the selected alternative in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). The Proposed Action would contribute 0.15 acres to the incremental increase in surface disturbance included in the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).

summer months could result in temporary displacement from the affected area, which may alter nest establishment or displacement.

Past, present, and future land uses have reduced and will likely continue to reduce the quality and quantity of habitats for wildlife species. Habitat alteration occurring throughout the range of these species would potentially reduce the ability of such species to recover. Cumulative impacts include habitat fragmentation, loss of prey species, increased predation, and loss of breeding habitat. Although many of these impacts continue to occur, many of these impacts as stated under the Proposed Action Alternative have been minimized or completely negated through wildlife mitigations and/or stipulations in accordance with the Vernal Field Office Land Use Plan.

Chapter 6. Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted:

6.1. Agency and Tribal Consultation

US Fish and Wildlife Service: No threatened of endangered species are present so no Endangered Species Act consultation is required.

Utah State Historic Preservation Officer: The BLM conducted consultation with the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Action as part of the GNB EIS process. Class III block surveys have been completed for the Project Area and the results of the surveys were sent to the Utah SHPO in March of 2011. Concurrences were included in Appendix E of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b). No cultural resources were identified within the APE of this proposed undertaking.

Tribal Consultation: The BLM initiated Government-to-Government consultation with 12 potentially affected and interested Native American Tribes as part of the GNB EIS process on January 9, 2008. As a result of the consultation request, the Navajo Nation requested notification of any unanticipated discoveries unearthed during the course of the project and the Pueblo of Laguna requested notification in the event any new archaeological sites are discovered and artifacts are recovered. No new sites or unanticipated discoveries have been found associated with the Proposed Action. The Hopi Tribe expressed concern with stone cairn sites previously documented in the GNBPA. At the request of the Hopi, the BLM and Director of the Hopi Office of Cultural Preservation visited several of the stone cairn sites in the GNBPA. In August 2009, the BLM prepared a report summarizing the site visit results. No written responses were received from the Hopi. The BLM met with the Hopi in April of 2011 to follow up on the expressed concerns. No further concerns were expressed. For documentation of this process and additional information refer to Appendix E of the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b).

6.2. Summary of Public Participation

The BLM posted notification of this EA on the Eplanning NEPA Register on 12 December 2013. No public interest has been expressed.

6.3. List of Preparers

Table 6.1. List of Preparers

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document
BLM Preparers		
Tyler Cox	Natural Resource Specialist	Project manager Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
Daniel Emmett	Wildlife Biologist	Review and revision of Migratory birds (including raptors).
Elizabeth Gamber	Paleontology Specialist	Review and revision of the Paleontology resource section.

Chapter 7. References Cited

7.1. References

Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2012a. Greater Natural Buttes Final Environmental Impact Statement, Vol. I, Chapters 1-9. BLM-UT-080-07-807. Vernal Field Office, Vernal Utah. March 2012.

_____. 2012b. Greater Natural Buttes Record of Decision. BLM-UT-080-07-807. Vernal Field Office, Vernal Utah. March 2012.

_____. 2011. Green River District Reclamation Guidelines for Reclamation Plans. Instruction Memorandum No. IM UTG000-2011-003 Green River District Reclamation Guidelines, March 2011. BLM Green River District.

_____. 2010. Memorandum of Understanding between BLM and US Fish and Wildlife Service to Promote the Conservation of Migratory Birds. BLM MOU WO-230-2010-04. 14p.

_____. 2009. Vernal Field Office Surface Disturbing Weed Policy. Instruction Memorandum No. UTG010-2010-001. Green River District, Vernal, Utah.

_____. 2008a. Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan. BLM-UT-PL-09-003-1610. Vernal Field Office, Vernal, Utah. October 2008.

_____. 2008b. Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Vernal Field Office, Vernal, Utah. August 2008.

_____. 1997. Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Grazing Management for BLM in Utah (BLM-UT-GI-97-001-4000). BLM, Utah State Office.

Parrish, J.R., F.P. Howe, R.E. Norvell. 2002. Utah Partners in Flight Avian Conservation Strategy Version 2.0. Utah Partners in Flight Program, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, 1594 West North Temple, Salt Lake City, UT 84116, UDWR Publication Number 02-27. i–xiv + 302 pp.

SWCA Environmental Consultants. 2013. Paleontological Assessment for the NBU 206–9 Pipeline. Uintah County, Utah.

Uintah County. 2011. Uintah County General Plan. Available online: http://co.uintah.ut.us/.

USDI and U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2007. Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development. BLM/WO/ST-06/021+3071/REV 07. Bureau of Land Management. Denver, Colorado. 84 pp.

Chapter 8. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Project Title: Kerr McGee proposes to install 1025 feet of 4 inch surface pipeline.

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2014–0029–EA

File/Serial Number:UTU63047A

Project Leader: Tyler Cox

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NI	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Emissions from earth-moving equipment and vehicle traffic, would not likely adversely affect air quality.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NP	BLM Natural Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	No cultural resources were identified within the APE of the proposed undertaking.	Cameron Cox	12/18/2013
NP	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	No Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) are identified within the APE. The proposed project will not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	Cameron Cox	12/18/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Jason R. West	11/21/2013

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	Livestock Grazing: The proposed project is located within the Sandwash cattle grazing allotment. The allotment is seasonally permitted from November 30 to April 30 with up to 4,523 AUMs. This area has many existing well pad sites and pipelines. The proposed pipe line will have very little effect on the livestock grazing. This area is heavily bisected by numerous roads and other oil and gas projects. Very little disturbance would occur other than increasing the traffic on the already existing roads. The proposal is consistent with multiple use of public lands and activities in the area. It is not anticipated that this proposal would negatively impact grazing operations. There are no known range improvements in this part of the allotment that would be impacted by this proposal. This proposal is not expected to affect Rangeland Health Standards in this allotment.	Craig L Newman	01/02/2014
PI	Paleontology	No scientifically important fossils were found. However, there is a high potential that important fossils will be unearthed during construction. Paleo monitoring is required for any ground disturbing activities.	Betty Gamber	11/27/2013
NP	Plants: BLM Sensitive	The proposed action was surveyed for Sterile yucca (*Yucca sterilis*) on 8/27/2013; no plants were found. No outcrops of Green River Shale formations are present in the vicinity of the proposed action and the nearest known mapped sensitive plant areas occur approximately 15 miles west upon VFO GIS review.	Maggie Marston	1/14/2014
NI	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	The proposed action falls outside of the VFO 2013 *Sclerocactus* wetlandicus and *S. brevispinus* USFWS/BLM-designated habitat polygons by a distance of greater than 3 miles. The nearest known individuals of *S. wetlandicus* occur approximately 3.6 miles northwest. Field Survey was conducted on 8/27/2013 for Sclerocactus wetlandicus within a 300' buffer; no individuals were located. Although the project will occur in desert pavement areas of mixed quality for threatened *Sclerocactus ssp.*the surface pipeline, as mitigated and surveyed in the proposed action, falls outside the parameters required for USFWS consultation and/or further mitigation. Surface disturbance is	Maggie Marston	1/14/2014

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	The proposed construction of the pipelines would alter the topography of the area to a small degree and change surface water flow patterns. It is not expected that surface water or stormwater would be created to the level of concern for Clean Water Act Section 402 (stormwater) review. In addition federal law has exempted energy development from stormwater requirements.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Water: Surface Water Quality	Surface waters: The only potential for the proposed project to negatively impact water quality would be increased potential for increased disturbance to surface soils which could cause soil erosion. This would not be expected to occur in a way that would be negative to surface waters. The site is in an upland area and more than a mile from perennial waters.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Water: Waters of the U.S.	None are present in the project area per USGS topographic map and GIS data review.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
NI	Wild Horses	The Project Area occurs within the Bonanza Herd Area/Herd Management Area as described in the VFO 2008 RMP. However, the Bonanza Herd Area is not actively managed for wild horses and any horses present on Federal lands are in trespass. As a result, the Proposed Action would not affect the management objectives of the Bonanza Herd Area.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013
PI	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds are present. No known raptor nests exist within project area.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	The project is not within designated big game habitat.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	Is the proposed project in sage grouse PPH or PGH? Yes ☐ No X If the answer is yes, the project must conform with WO IM 2012-043.	Daniel Emmett	11/22/2013
NP	Woodlands/Forestry	None Present as per Vernal Field Office RMP/ROD and GIS database.	Tyler Cox	11/19/2013

FINAL REVIEW:			
Reviewer Title	**Signature**	**Date**	**Comments**
Environmental Coordinator	Stephanie J Howard	1/29/14	
Authorized Officer		1-31-2014	