

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0021-EA**

January 2014

**Water Pipeline for Hacking Land & Livestock
UTU-89316**

Location: *Salt Lake Meridian,
T. 8 S., R. 20 E.,
sec. 3, SW¹/₄NW¹/₄.
Uintah County, Utah*

Applicant/Address: *Hacking Land & Livestock, LLC.
170 South 500 East
Vernal, Utah 84078*

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Vernal Field Office
170 South 500 East
Vernal, Utah 84078
Phone: (435) 781-4400
Fax: (435) 781-3420



Hacking Land & Livestock's irrigation water pipeline

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0021-EA

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to analyze Hacking Land & Livestock, LLCs (Hacking) proposal to obtain a grant authorization (UTU-89316) which would include an irrigation pipeline from the US Fish & Wildlife Service's existing irrigation pipeline (UTU-65145) to Hacking's private property located at T. 8 S., R. 20 E., sec. 3, lot 3.

The EA is a site-specific analysis of potential impacts that could result with the implementation of a proposed action or alternatives to the proposed action. The EA assists the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in project planning and ensuring compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and in making a determination as to whether any "significant" impacts could result from the analyzed actions. "Significance" is defined by NEPA and is found in regulation 40 CFR 1 508.27. An EA provides evidence for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a statement of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI). A FONSI statement, is a document that briefly presents the reasons why implementation of the selected alternative would not result in "significant" environmental impacts (effects) beyond those already addressed in the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan (October 2008). If the decision maker determines that this project has "significant" impacts following the analysis in the EA, an EIS would be prepared for the project. If not, a Decision Record may be signed for the EA approving the alternative selected.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The BLM's need is to consider approval of the application. BLM's purpose is to avoid or reduces impacts on sensitive resource values associated with the project area and prevent unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands.

CONFORMANCE WITH BLM LAND USE PLAN(S)

The proposed action would be in conformance with the Vernal Field Office RMP/ROD (October 2008). The RMP/ROD decision allows ROWs on public lands in accordance with the Realty Decisions. It has been determined that the proposed action and alternative(s) would not conflict with any decisions throughout the plan.

RELATIONSHIPS TO STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND OTHER PLANS

This EA was prepared by the BLM in accordance with NEPA of 1969 and in compliance with all applicable regulations and laws passed subsequently, including the President's Council on Environmental Quality regulations, U.S. Department of Interior requirements and guidelines listed in the BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1. This EA assesses the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and No Action Alternative.

The proposed action is also consistent with the Uintah County General Plan (Uintah County 2011-as amended). The Uintah County General Plan contains specific policy statements addressing public land, multiple-use, resource use and development, access, and wildlife management. In general, the plan indicates support for development proposals through its emphasis on multiple-use public land management practices and responsible use and optimum utilization of public land resources. The County, through the Plan, supports the development of natural resources as they become available, as new technology allows.

CHAPTER 2 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the Proposed Action Alternative, as submitted by Hacking as well as, the No Action Alternative.

PROPOSED ACTION

Hacking proposes to install an irrigation pipeline from an existing pipeline (UTU-65145) to land acquired for agricultural purposes. The pipeline would consist of initial construction disturbance not to exceed 3052.5-feet in length and 30-feet in width (2.102 acres). Of this, 1757.5-foot long by 30-feet wide (1.21 acres) is located on lands administered by BLM.

The pipeline would be eight-inch PVC pipe buried a minimum of 30-inches deep in a trench not to exceed three-feet wide. The trench would be bedded & backfilled with materials no larger than 3/4-inch minus to 6-inches above the pipeline. The remainder of the trench would be backfilled with 6-inch minus materials and free of any frozen material with a 6-inch mound over the backfilled trench. Air vents would be located at every 1000-feet or at any high spots. Drains would be placed in all low spots.

A pump shelter may also be installed; however, the shelter would be built on private lands. The shelter would consist of a 4-foot long by 8-foot wide and 8-inch thick concrete pad and would be built of either steel or wood framing materials. The shelter would be 4-foot long, 8-feet wide and have a sloping roof line from 5 to 7-feet tall. The PVC pipeline would have PVC to steel adapters at the underground pipeline level and would then angle upwards toward the shelter as steel pipeline where the water pressure would be boosted sent back underground via steel pipeline to steel to PVC adapter and continue to the end of the pipeline.

Reclamation . The reclamation plan for the Hacking Land & Livestock pipeline is comprised of the following actions:

During trench excavation, the topsoil will be segregated from the underlying subsoil material, and windrowed adjacent to the pipeline trench. The disturbed area will be final graded to blend in with the surrounding topography with a slight windrow over the pipeline trench to allow for settling. All disturbed areas will be reseeded with the attached seed mixture.

Seed Mix:	Lbs/PLS
Western wheatgrass	3.48
Indian ricegrass	2.74
Needle & thread grass	1.63
Galleta	1.59
Sand dropseed	1.67
Shadscale saltbrush	0.80
Wyoming sagebrush	0.19
Fourwing saltbush	0.84
Total	12.93

All poundage is in terms of Pure Live Seed. Seed shall be weed free. Seed will be applied in the fall of the year between September 15 and December 15. Weed control will consist of the application of annual weed control prior to seed set each year until the planted native species are well established.

NO ACTION

Under this action, BLM would not approve the ROW grant.

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL SETTING

The Interdisciplinary Team Checklist provides a brief description of the affected environment. The affected environment and environmental consequences of the alternatives were considered and analyzed by an interdisciplinary team as documented in Appendix B. The analysis indicates that resources of concern are either not present in the project area, or would not be impacted to a degree that requires detailed analysis. The analysis and rationale for this conclusion is provided in Appendix B. The below information describes the current state of the potentially affected resources in the project area.

Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds (EO 13112), Soils, and Vegetation:

Based on soil types in the area, vegetation in the vicinity of the proposed surface disturbance most likely includes fourwing saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), shadscale saltbush (*Atriplex confertifolia*), mat saltbush (*Atriplex corrugata*), Torrey's jointfir (*Ephedra torreyana*), Native American pipeweed (*Eriogonum inflatum*), needleandthread (*Hesperostipa comata*), winterfat (*Krascheninnikovia lanata*), galleta (*Pleuraphis jamesii*), and sand dropseed (*Sporobolus cryptandrus*). Noxious weeds documented within and near the project area include broadleaved pepperweed (*Lepidium latifolium*), Russian knapweed (*Acroptilon repens*), Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*), and saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*). Other invasive weeds likely to grow near and within the project area include cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), halogeton (*Halogeton glomeratus*), and Russian thistle (*Salsola iberica*).

Soils in the area are considered Tipperary loamy sands (2009, NRCS). These soils are on low slopes and involve eolian deposits derived from sandstone structures (2009, NRCS). Depth to restrictive features are more than 80 inches, with a high to moderate high capacity to transmit water since most of the material is sandy loams (2009, NRCS). Infiltration rates are also high with these types of soils, so runoff potentials are lower than a clay type soil; however, erosion rates are also higher with sandier soils.

CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS

This chapter describes the direct and indirect impacts that would be expected to occur upon the implementation of each of the considered alternatives. It also discloses the expected cumulative impacts, which are those impacts resulting from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.

PROPOSED ACTION

This section analyzes the impacts of the proposed action to those resources described in the affected environment section 3 above.

Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds (EO 13112), Soils, and Vegetation:

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 1.21 acre of soils and vegetation.

The project would contribute an estimated additional 3.0 tons of soil per acre per year above the current natural erosion rate for the first year of development. After the first year, the soil erosion attributed to the project would reduce to 1.5 tons per acre per year until the access is eventually abandoned. Erosion rates are higher during the first year due to disturbance during construction. Erosion rates would continue at a higher rate for the life of the road.

Direct impacts to soils include soil compaction and loss of soil/topsoil through wind and water erosion.

Additional direct impacts to vegetation are primarily associated with clearing of vegetation during construction. Indirect impacts to vegetation resources 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.

Mitigation for Invasive Weeds

- The project reclamation would be in conformance with the Green River District Reclamation Policy.
- The following measures from the Vernal Field Office Weed Policy would apply to this project.
 - A pre-disturbance noxious weed inventory shall be conducted on all surface disturbing projects to determine the presence of noxious weeds prior to beginning the project.
 - All vehicles and equipment shall be cleaned either through power-washing, or other approved method, if the vehicles or equipment were previously operated outside the Uinta Basin, to prevent weed seed introduction.
 - Certified noxious weed free seed and mulch shall be used in all reclamation projects.

- Weeds shall be controlled within the disturbance areas, including borrow areas along roads.
- All disturbance areas shall be monitored for noxious weeds annually, for a minimum of three growing seasons following completion of project or until desirable vegetation is established.
- All surface disturbing projects shall have an approved Pesticide Use Proposal (PUP) prior to chemical application on BLM lands.

The Proposed Action would disturb approximately 1.21 acres of soils and vegetation. Of this the total acres disturbed would be subject to interim reclamation. If final reclamation is successful, direct long-term impacts to vegetation would occur on 0 acres. If final reclamation is not successful, the entire 1.21 acres of disturbed soils could remain barren and has the potential to increase soil erosion rates in the basin.

The project would contribute an estimated additional 3.0 tons of soil per acre per year above the current natural erosion rate for the first year of development. After the first year, the soil erosion attributed to the project would reduce to 1.5 tons per acre per year until the access roads and well pads are fully reclaimed. Erosion rates are higher during the first year due to disturbance during construction, when soils are bare and free of vegetation.

Direct impacts to soils include mixing of soil horizons, soil compaction, short-term loss of topsoil and site productivity, and loss of soil/topsoil through wind and water erosion. Loss of soil/topsoil in disturbed areas would reduce the re-vegetation success of seeded native species due to increased competition by annual weed species. Annual weed species are adapted to disturbed conditions, and have less stringent moisture and soil nutrient requirements than do perennial native species. Indirect impacts could be less plants diversity since the soils could be leached due to lack of growth media protecting the fragile soil resources. Other animals would have less to forage on if soils are leached to a point that no vegetation would grow on the site. Water quality could change in downstream environments if bare soils runoff into those systems. Additional sediment to any system has the potential to affect water quality.

Impacts to soils and vegetation cover would be partially mitigated by reclamation of disturbed areas with native vegetation and control of noxious and invasive weeds by mechanical and chemical treatment.

NO ACTION

Under this action, BLM would not approve the ROW grant. Hacking would not be allowed to install the 8-inch irrigation pipeline on federal land and would need to find another route and source for irrigation water.

Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation:

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no direct disturbance or indirect effects to invasive plants/noxious weeds, soils or vegetation from surface-disturbing activities associated with the proposed project. Soil erosion and sediment rates would continue on the existing roadway. Current land use trends in the area would continue, including increased industrial development, increased off-highway vehicles (OHV) traffic, and increased recreation use.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts are those impacts resulting from the incremental impact of an action when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other actions.

Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils & Vegetation

The CIAA for Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation is the Pelican Lake Watershed. This area covers approximately 18,515 acres of land managed by the BLM, Ute Tribe, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, State of Utah, and private landowners. Within the CIAA, there are approximately 71 miles of roads. Approximately 6,666 acres (36% of the CIAA) have been converted to agricultural use. Past, present and reasonably foreseeable disturbance from oil and gas will affect 447 acres (2.4% of the CIAA), as shown in Table 1. Cumulative impacts include dust impacts to plants, and plant and pollinator habitat destruction. Surface disturbance is a good indicator of the extent of these cumulative impacts.

Table 1

	Project Area (acres)	Surface Disturbance Analyzed (acres)	Project Area within the CIAA (acres)	Surface Disturbance within the CIAA¹ (acres)
Ongoing Field Development				
Greater Deadman Bench EIS	98,785	4,561	265	12
Past Developments and Current and Future Developments Not Covered by a Field Development NEPA Document				
5 abandoned well locations ^{2,3}	NA ⁴	NA	NA	26
64 producing well pads ^{2,3}	NA	NA	NA	249.5
57 proposed well pads	NA	NA	NA	144.5
Field Development Proposals				
Randlett EDA Area Programmatic Leasing and Exploration Project EA	53,380	2,613	304	15
Total CIAA disturbance from oil and gas				
	--	--	--	447 (2.4%)
Current Project				
Proposed Action	NA	NA	NA	1.21
No Action	NA	NA	NA	0
Total CIAA disturbance from oil and gas plus proposed action				
	--	--	--	448.2 (2.4%)
¹ Assumes surface disturbance was authorized evenly across the analysis area of the document.				
² Uses the assumption contained within the Greater Uinta Basin Cumulative Impacts Technical Support Document.				
³ As of 12/10/2013				
⁴ NA = not applicable				

Cumulative impacts typical of oil and gas field development include: removal of native vegetation and increased erosion rates of soils which are generally very thin, slow to develop, and difficult to reclaim due to the arid climate and the low organic content.

Soil erosion would be increased due to the disturbance associated with oil and gas activities in the area. Each acre of disturbance adds to a cumulative effect by increasing erosion and destroying native vegetation, and through the invasion of undesired plant species. In general, soils in the Uinta Basin are very thin, slow to develop, and difficult to reclaim because of the arid climate and lack of organic material.

CHAPTER 5 PERSONS, GROUPS, AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

The proposed action was posted to the public Environmental Notification Bulletin Board with its assigned NEPA number on January 26, 2011. To date, no questions or comments have been received.

Notice letters were sent to other ROW holders adjacent to the proposed project area on December 13, 2013. No responses were received from the adjacent ROW holders.

A public comment period was not offered due to the proposed action being similar in nature to other projects in the immediate area.

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings and Conclusions
Lori Hunsaker, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Archaeology	National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Consultation	Section 106 Process was initiated on 07/1/2013. Concurrence was received on 07/15/2013
Eastern Shoshone Tribe, Northwest Band Shoshone Tribe, Ute Indian Tribe, Goshute Indian Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Southern Ute Tribe, White Mesa Ute Tribe, Laguna Pueblo Tribe, Santa Clara Pueblo Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Zia Pueblo Tribe and Navajo Nation	National Historic Preservation Act	Tribal Consultation begun on 07/15/2013. The Pueblo of Laguna responded that the undertaking will not have a significant impact. No other tribes have responded within the 30 day comment period.

LIST OF PREPARERS

See Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist (Appendix B).

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS EA:

AO	Authorized Officer
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
DR	Decision Record
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ENBB	Environmental Notification Bulletin Board
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
ID	Interdisciplinary
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
RFA	Reasonably Foreseeable Action

RMP Resource Management Plan
ROD Record of Decision
ROW Right-of-Way

REFERENCES

BLM. 2008. Vernal Field Office Final EIS. Utah BLM, Vernal District. Final Environmental Impact Statement Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision.

Parrish, J.R., F.P. Howe and 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, Utah 84116. UDWR Publication Number 02-27. i – xiv + 302 pp.

2009, NRCS Soil Survey Area, Uintah Area, Utah-Parts of Daggett, Grand and Uintah Counties. Survey Area Data: Version 7, Oct 5, 2009.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Drawing

APPENDIX B: Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist

Exhibit A: Map

Exhibit B: Stipulations and Reclamation

**APPENDIX A
DRAWING**

APPENDIX B
INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM CHECKLIST

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM NEPA DOCUMENTATION TRACKING CHECKLIST

Project Title: *Hacking Land & Livestock's irrigation water pipeline*

NEPA Log Number: *DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0021-EA*

File/Serial Number: *UTU-89316*

Project Leader: *Katie White Bull*

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 significant impact analyzed in detail in the EA; or identified in a DNA as requiring further analysis

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section C of the DNA form.

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NI	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Dust and vehicle emissions would be generated during the project. However, impacts from emissions are expected to be short term (during construction only) and indistinguishable from background emissions as measured by monitors or predicted by models. Greenhouse gas emissions: No greenhouse gas standards have been established by EPA or other regulatory authorities. The assessment of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change is in its earliest stage. Global greenhouse gas models can be inconsistent, and localized models are lacking. Consequently, it is not technically feasible to quantify the net impacts to climate based on local greenhouse gas emissions. It is anticipated that greenhouse gas emissions associated with this action and its alternative(s) would be negligible.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NP	BLM Natural Areas	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NP	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	A determination of No Historic Properties Affected was made by SHPO on 07/15/2013. Report #U-13-SH-0169	Jimmie McKenzie	8/1/13
NP	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	Letters were mailed to Tribes on 07/10/2013. Response received from the Hopi Tribe stated no historic properties would be affected (red'd 7/22/2013)	Jimmie McKeinzie	8/1/13
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NI	Environmental Justice	No minority or economically disadvantaged communities or populations would be disproportionately adversely affected by the proposed action or alternatives.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NI	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)	All prime farmlands must be irrigated to be considered under this designation, among other factors. No prime or unique farmlands, as identified by the NRCS, based on soil survey data for the county are located in the project area; therefore, this resource will not be carried forward for analysis.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NI	Fuels/Fire Management	There are no planned fuels projects in the immediate area. Disturbance in this vegetation type could increase the amount of invasive plants, specifically Bromus tectorum. The increase of Bromus tectorum could lead to a change of ecosystem dynamics and an increase in fire frequency. Applying the reclamation guidelines should prevent additional hazardous fuels.	Blaine Tarbell	11/08/13
NI	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production	No adverse impacts to geology or mineral resources are expected.	Elizabeth Gamber	12/1/2013
IP/NW: PI Soils: PI Veg: PI	Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds (EO 13112), Soils, and Vegetation	<p>IP/NW: Approximately 1.2 acres of previously undisturbed native vegetation will be disturbed. Disturbance is likely to create a favorable environment for invasive plants and noxious weeds to establish. Broadleaved pepperweed, russian knapweed, salt cedar, and russian olive have been documented within the project area. A weed treatment plan should be included in the POD.</p> <p>Soils: Approximately 1.21 acres of soils would be disturbed according to the proposed action. Soils in the area are typical of a high desert ecosystem. The soils in the area according to NRCS soil survey are Tipperary loamy fine sand derived from eolian deposits from sandstone. These soils are prone to erosion and care should be taken by the company to reduce soil losses by implementing some kind of smart soil management techniques, for example, saving of the topsoil resource separate from the subsoil's, using waddles to control sediment transport, and keeping all soils on the approved ROW.</p> <p>Veg: Vegetation types in the project area include intermountain basin greasewood flats. Approximately 1.2 acres of previously undisturbed land will be disturbed for the proposed action, and the disturbance will be reclaimed, though some long-lasting changes to the native plant community are expected.</p>	<p>IP/NW: Jessi Brunson</p> <p>Soils: James Hereford II</p> <p>Veg: Jessi Brunson</p>	<p>IP/NW: 12/6/13</p> <p>Soils: 12/9/2013</p> <p>Veg:12/6/13</p>
NI	Lands / Access	BLM notified all potentially affected ROW holders of the proposal. To date no comments have been received.	Katie White Bull	12/12/13
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	The project was surveyed as part of the Pelican Lake Area (UT_TSOS_2011_WCNWC) and found to contain no wilderness character	Dan Gilfillan	11/19/13
NI	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	Livestock Grazing: The proposed project is located within the Twelve Mile cattle grazing allotment in one of the isolated tracts near Pelican Reservoir. The allotment is seasonally permitted from October 1 to April 30 with up to 2781 AUMs over the entire allotment. This area has many existing well sites and the proposed pipe line will have very little effect on the livestock grazing. This area is bisected by numerous roads and other oil and gas projects. The surface disturbance of 1.2 acres would be very small in relation to the 600 acres total in that pasture. Coordination may be needed during the installation time with the grazing permittee depending on time of year. 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 Newman	01/02/14

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NP	Paleontology	A Preliminary Paleontological Survey Report (survey conducted by Uinta Paleo for Axia wells 3-32-820/3-33-820, February 22, 2012) showed no bedrock exposures at the surface and no fossils found.	Elizabeth Gamber	12/3/2013
NP	Plants: BLM Sensitive	No UT BLM sensitive plant species are present in the same or an adjacent subwatershed as the proposed project.	Jessi Brunson	12/6/13
NI	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	The following federally listed, proposed, or candidate plant species are present or expected within the same or an adjacent subwatershed as the proposed project: Uinta Basin hookless cactus (<i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i>) and Pariette cactus (<i>Sclerocactus brevispinus</i>). The proposed project is located outside of the 2013 potential habitat polygon for Uinta Basin hookless and Pariette cactus. Furthermore, analysis of aerial imagery in GIS indicates no potential habitat is present.	Jessi Brunson	12/6/13
NP	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	No mapped wetland or riparian habitat exists on the proposed area as per GIS review and 2008 Vernal RMP analysis.	James Hereford II	12/9/2013
NI	Recreation	No developed recreation sites/trails or Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) exist within the project area. Limited recreational use in the area. Considered part of the Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), where limited recreation management takes place. Recreational use of off highway vehicles (OHVs) is restricted to existing roads and trails. The permitted use OHVs for stone collection would not be subject to this restriction.	Dan Gilfillan	11/19/13
NP	Socio-Economics	No impact to the social or economic status of the county or nearby communities would occur from this project due to its small size in relation to ongoing development throughout the Basin.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NI	Visual Resources	The identified project area occurs within VRM Class III Lands. The objective of VRM III is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be moderate. The proposed action would be in conformance with this VRM objective.	Dan Gilfillan	11/19/13
NP	Wastes (hazardous or solid)	<i>Hazardous Waste:</i> No chemicals subject to reporting under SARA Title III in an amount equal to or greater than 10,000 pounds will be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of annually in association with the project. Furthermore, no extremely hazardous substances, as defined in 40 CFR 355, in threshold Wastes (hazardous or planning quantities, will be used, produced, stored, solid) transported, or disposed of in association with the project. <i>Solid Wastes:</i> Trash would be confined in a covered container and hauled to an approved landfill. Burning of waste or oil would not be done. Human waste would be contained and be disposed of at an approved sewage treatment facility.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NI	Water: Floodplains	Although the historic Ouray Canal floodplain exists adjacent to the proposed action, the amount of work for this proposed action in this zone will not affect the functionality of the floodplain environment, and will not affect the manmade floodplain to a degree that would require detailed analysis. This is mainly due to the nature of the environment and the amount of soils that are proposed to be disturbed. Since acres disturbed is low and the company has agreed to do reclamation in a timely manner, no	James Hereford II	12/9/2013

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
		additional analysis is required.		
NI	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	The proposed action will not alter the current hydrologic conditions on the ground. The amount of disturbance is low enough to not alter the dry ephemeral type hydrology in the area. Care should still take place to minimize soil disturbance which could affect hydrologic conditions if a large amount of dirt is being moved. It is proposed that only 1 acre of BLM land will be disturbed, and it will undergo final reclamation as soon as possible.	James Hereford II	12/9/2013
NI	Water: Surface Water Quality	The proposed action will not affect surface water quality in the area as per GIS review, 2008 Vernal RMP review, and since the disturbance of the PA is only 1 acre on BLM lands, this will not affect water quality to a degree that would require detailed analysis.	James Hereford II	12/9/2013
NI	Water: Groundwater Quality	Groundwater is likely present at a depth of over 500 ft below the ground surface and would not be impacted by this project.	Elizabeth Gamber	12/1/2013
NI	Water: Waters of the U.S.	Waters of the U.S. will not be affected by the proposed action as per GIS data review and 2008 Vernal RMP analysis. Care should be taken to reduce any potential sediment from leaving the ROW.	James Hereford II	12/9/2013
NP	Wild Horses	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13
NI	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	Though big game may be found within the project area the BLM does not identify crucial habitat for big game species. In addition, known prairie dog colonies are located outside the project area.	Brandon McDonald	11/25/13
NI	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds may be present within the project area; however, proposed disturbance is not anticipated to disrupt nesting or nuptial behavior. In addition, there is no known raptor nests located within ½ mile of the project area.	Brandon McDonald	11/25/13
NP	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	In review of field visits and and district files there are no threatened, endangered, proposed, or candidate animal species within or near the project area. There is no greater sage-grouse PPH areas near the project area.	Brandon McDonald	11/25/13
NP	Woodland/Forestry	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Katie White Bull	11/5/13

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
NEPA / Environmental Coordinator			
Authorized Officer			

EXHIBIT “A”

MAP

EXHIBIT B
STIPULATIONS
RECLAMATION PLAN

Right-of-Way UTU-89316

HACKING LAND AND LIVESTOCK, LLC

Reclamation Plan

The reclamation plan for the Hacking Land & Livestock pipeline is comprised of the following actions:

During trench excavation, the topsoil will be segregated from the underlying subsoil material, and windrowed adjacent to the pipeline trench. The disturbed area will be final graded to blend in with the surrounding topography with a slight windrow over the pipeline trench to allow for settling. All disturbed areas will be reseeded with the attached seed mixture.

Seed Mix:	Lbs/PLS
Western wheatgrass	3.48
Indian ricegrass	2.74
Needle & thread grass	1.63
Galleta	1.59
Sand dropseed	1.67
Shadscale saltbrush	0.80
Wyoming sagebrush	0.19
Fourwing saltbush	0.84
Total	12.93

All poundage is in terms of Pure Live Seed. Seed shall be weed free. Seed will be applied in the fall of the year between September 15 and December 15. Weed control will consist of the application of annual weed control prior to seed set each year until the planted native species are well established.

EXHIBIT "B" January 27, 2014

Reclamation Plan