

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

---

**Categorical Exclusion**

**DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0087-CX  
QEP RW 42-25AGR Pipeline Reroute**

**PREPARING OFFICE**

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



**Categorical Exclusion**  
**DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0087-CX**  
**QEP RW 42-25AGR Pipeline Reroute**

This page intentionally  
left blank

# Table of Contents

<b>1. QEP RW 42-25AGR Pipeline Reroute .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix A. ....</b>	<b>3</b>
A.1. Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation .....	3
A.1.1. Categorical Exclusion Rationale .....	3

This page intentionally  
left blank

# **Chapter 1. QEP RW 42-25AGR Pipeline Reroute**

This page intentionally  
left blank

Chapter 1. QEP R77 42-254GR Pipeline  
Reports

## **A. Background**

**BLM Office:** Vernal Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.:** DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0087-CX

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** QEP RW 42-25AGR Pipeline Reroute

**Location of Proposed Action:** The project area is approximately 26 miles south of Vernal, Utah; in the SENE Section 25, T7S R22E.

### **Description of Proposed Action:**

QEP Energy Company (QEP) proposes to install a natural gas surface pipeline from the approved RW 42-25AGR well pad to an existing valve located at the RW 32-25AGR that ties into an existing 8 inch pipeline. The project will require 2,131 feet of 10.75 inch (or less) pipeline. The proposed pipeline would serve to connect the RW 42-25AGR to an existing main gathering line for field compression and dehydration. The proposed actions described in the Sundry and the attached Conditions of Approval (COA) are needed to develop the gas reserves in accordance with the Oil and Gas lease number identified above.

## **B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

**Land Use Plan Name:** Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan

**Date Approved/Amended:** ROD approved in 2008

**The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):**

**The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions) :** The RMP/ROD decision allows leasing of oil and gas while protecting or mitigating other resource values (RMP/ROD p. 97-99). The Minerals and Energy Resources Management Objectives encourage the drilling of oil and gas wells by private industry (RMP/ROD, p. 97). The RMP/ROD decision also allows for processing applications, permits, operating plans, mineral exchanges, leases on public lands in accordance with policy and guidance and allows for management of public lands to support goals and objectives of other resources programs, respond to public requests for land use authorizations, and acquire administrative and public access where necessary (RMP/ROD p. 86). It has been determined that the proposed action and alternative(s) would not conflict with other decisions throughout the plan.

## **C. Compliance with NEPA:**

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 43 CFR Part 46.210E12 which is:

(12) Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR Part 46.215 apply.

I considered the proposed action to install a surface pipeline from the RW 42-25AGR well pad to an existing valve located at the RW 32-25AGR, with the stipulations and conditions of approval (COA) identified in Attachment 1. The stipulations and COA's are required by this decision, and variance from these stipulations and COA's during project implementation may require further NEPA review. In addition, I have reviewed the plan conformance statement and have determined that the proposed activity is in conformance with the applicable land use plan(s).

I considered the extraordinary circumstances as documented in the Extraordinary Circumstances Worksheet.

## **D. Approval and Contact Information**

  
Jerry Kenczka  
Assistant Field Manager

FEB 28 2014

Date

# Appendix A.

## A.1. Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation

### A.1.1. Categorical Exclusion Rationale

CX Number:	DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0087-CX
Date:	2/25/2014
Lease/Case File/ Serial Number:	UTU-0561
Regulatory Authority (CFR or Law):	43 CFR Part 46.210E12

#### Section 1.1 Impacts on Public Health and Safety

1. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on public health and safety?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** Public health and safety would not be affected by this action. The proponent will abide by all safety procedures for proper use of their equipment as required by law.

#### Section 1.2 Impacts on Natural Resources or Unique Geographic Characteristics

2. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** There are no unique geographic characteristics; historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; or other ecologically significant or critical areas within the proposed project area per cultural reports, BLM GIS database layers, and onsite observations. No lands designated as Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wilderness Study Areas, Monuments, or other areas of special designation are located within the proposed project area, and the proposed project would not impact any specially designated lands. Migratory birds are present in the project area; however, the proposed project is not expected to significantly impact migratory bird habitat, forage, or nesting areas.

#### Section 1.3 Level of Controversy

3. Does the proposed action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** Similar projects to the proposed action have occurred in adjacent areas with similar resources present; the impacts of these projects are well-known and demonstrated in other projects that have been implemented and monitored.

### Section 1.4 Highly Uncertain or Unique or Unknown Environmental Risks

4. Does the proposed action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** The proposed project is similar to many other proposed gas well drilling projects near the project area. The consequences of the proposed action can generally be predicted based on the consequences of similar actions, and these consequences are well established as insignificant.

### Section 1.5 Precedent Setting

5. Does the proposed action establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** The proposed action is not connected to another action that would require further environmental analysis and would not set a precedent for future actions that would normally require environmental analysis.

### Section 1.6 Cumulatively Significant Effects

6. Does the proposed action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** The proposed project is not expected to have a direct relationship to other actions that will cumulatively have a significant environmental effect. Other actions in the project area that are directly related to the proposed action also have insignificant environmental impacts, and the combined impact of these projects and the proposed action is not expected to be significant.

### Section 1.7 Impacts on Cultural Properties

7. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Erin Goslin, Archaeologist

**Rationale:** Class III cultural surveys have been completed for the proposed project area; no significant cultural resources were found.

### Section 1.8 Impacts on Federally Listed Species or Critical Habitat

8. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Maggie Marston, Botanist
	X	Dixie Sadlier, Wildlife Biologist

**Rationale:** No formal Section 7 consultation/concurrence with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was required or requested. Consultation has already been completed for water sources that will be used in construction of the pipeline. Threatened and Endangered Species review has occurred through the onsite as well as BLM GIS data. All appropriate mitigation measures have been applied through the Conditions of Approval for this project. No coordination with the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources was required or requested.

Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, Proposed, BLM Sensitive Plants: Survey was conducted for all TES species on November 13, 2013. Survey included *Sclerocactus* species, Utes Ladies'-tresses, and horseshoe milkvetch and was negative for all three plant species.

### Section 1.9 Compliance With Laws

9. Does the proposed action violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** The proposed action would not violate any county or state statutes. Formal Section 7 consultation with USFWS for Threatened and Endangered species was not required or requested for this project; consultation for water depletion has already been completed: the proposed project would not violate the Endangered Species Act. Onsite observations, BLM GIS, and air quality studies/modeling data have shown that the proposed project will not violate the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, or Migratory Bird Act.

### Section 1.10 Environmental Justice

10. Does the proposed action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** Low income or minority populations are not present in the project area. Low income or minority populations would not receive disproportionately high or adverse human health or environmental effects from the proposed action. Health and environmental statutes would not be compromised by the proposed action.

### Section 1.11 Indian Sacred Sites

11. Does the proposed action limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Erin Goslin, Archaeologist

**Rationale:** Cultural surveys/reports and tribal consultation show that the proposed project would not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.

### Section 1.12 Noxious and Non-Native Invasive Species


12. Does the proposed action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?		
YES	NO	REVIEWER/TITLE
	X	Kevin Sadlier, Natural Resource Specialist

**Rationale:** The operator would control noxious/invasive weeds adjacent to applicable facilities by the application of herbicides or by mechanical removal until reclamation is considered to be successful by the authorized officer (AO) and the bond for the well is released. A list of noxious weeds would be obtained from the BLM or the appropriate county extension office. On BLM-administered land, the operator would submit a Pesticide Use Proposal and obtain approval prior to the application of herbicides, other pesticides, or possible hazardous chemicals.

To prevent noxious weed seed establishment, construction equipment and vehicles would be power washed prior to entering the project area. After completion of construction activities and facility installation, vegetative cover would be re-established by the operator in any areas of incidental surface disturbance.

### Section 1.2 Preparer Information

  
 Kevin Sadlier,  
 Natural Resource Specialist

  
 Date

  
 Jerry Kenozka,  
 Assistant Field Manager

FEB 28 2014  
 Date