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

Categorical Exclusion

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0232CX
Newfield proposes to install a flow line for the Tar Sands Fed 10-30-8-17

PREPARING OFFICE

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

Categorical Exclusion

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0232CX

Newfield proposes to install a flow line for the Tar Sands Fed 10-30-8-17

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Newfield proposes to install a flow line for the Tar Sands Fed 10-30-8-17 1

Appendix A. 5

A.1. Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation 5
A.1.1. Categorical Exclusion Rationale 5

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Newfield proposes to install a flow line for the Tar Sands Fed 10-30-8-17

This page intentionally
left blank

A. Background

BLM Office: Vernal Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0232-CX

Proposed Action Title/Type: Newfield proposes to install a flow line for the Tar Sands Fed 10-30-8-17

Location of Proposed Action: The project area is approximately 10 miles south of Myton, Utah; in the NWSE Section 30, T8S R18E.

Description of Proposed Action:

Newfield Production Company requests an 862' x 30' corridor on the north side of the authorized access road for the construction, operation and maintenance of a 10" surface flow line bundle for the Tar Sands Fed 10–30–8–17 to the existing flow line tie-in point at/near the 11–30–8–17.

The staging of the project would take place from the existing well pads and road surfaces, and would share a corridor with an existing buried water line, authorized with the S-30–8–17 APD (approved 1/9/2012). There are not any cross-country portions proposed with this activity

The entirety of this project is within the Greater Monument Butte Unit (UTU-87538X) and all applicable commodities are unitized and would be gathered at the Newfield's GOSP #4 facility; an updated sundry list of all GOSP #4 well would follow this authorzation with 30 days of construction start. Newfield would construct, operate, maintain, and reclain the project area in accordance the February 2012 Greater Monument Butte SOP.

Newfield has agreed to do the following:

- All construction/placement activities for the surface flow line must be monitored by an on-site archaeologist to ensure avoidance of Feature W and any artifact concentrations. Photographic documentation of before and after completion is to be included in the monitor report.

  Sclerocactus spot check surveys should be conducted on an annual basis by a qualified botanist, and reviewed by the Authorized Officer (AO), for all planned disturbance areas, if the project has not been completed within the year following the pre-construction plant surveys. Review of spot checks may result in additional pre-construction plant surveys as recommended by the AO. If the proposed action or parts thereof have not occurred within four (4) years of the original survey, additional coordination with the AO must occur, and a new clearance survey may be necessary prior to ground disturbing activities.

  Sclerocactus surveys for surface pipelines placed within an existing road ROW, and within 10 feet from the edge of the disturbed surface of the road, will include the ROW and 50 feet from the edge of the ROW on the pipeline side of the road.

  Dust suppression as a result of oil and gas operations will be performed throughout the life of the project, using suitable produced water under hot, windy, and/or dry conditions, and will depend on soil types and the moisture content of the soils where activities are taking place. Dust suppression will be most commonly implemented during the summer months.

Equipment and vehicles entering the project area from outside the Uinta Basin will be power-washed to remove seeds and plant material.

Within suitable *Sclerocactus* habitat project infrastructure will be designed to minimize impacts, specifically:

o Share common right-of-ways (ROW) for roads and pipelines where possible

o Employees and contractors of the operator will remain on designated routes and other cleared/approved areas.

o Revegetate all disturbed areas with native seed mixes comprised of species indigenous to the project area, and non-native species that are unlikely to become weedy/invasive

Dust abatement will be implemented in suitable *Sclerocactus* habitat throughout the life of the project during the time of year when *Sclerocactus*species are most vulnerable to dust-related impacts (March through August).

Reinitiation of Section 7 consultation with the Service will be sought immediately if any loss of plants or occupied habitat for *Sclerocactus* is anticipated as a result of project activities.

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 10" from the Tar Sands Fed 10–30–8–17 to the existing flow line tie-in point at/near the 11–30–8–17.

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

D. Approval and Contact Information

AUG 2 8 2014

Jerry Kenczka,
Assistant Field Manager

Date

This page intentionally
left blank

Appendix A.

A.1. Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation

A.1.1. Categorical Exclusion Rationale

CX Number:	DOI-BLM-UT-G010–2014–0232–CX
Date:	8/15/2014
Lease/Case File/ Serial Number:	UTU-74869
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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	Leticia Neal, Archaeologist

Rationale: Class III cultural surveys have been completed for the proposed project area. Cultural Resources that are eligible for inclusion into the NRHP are identified within the APE of the proposed project. Utah SHPO has concurred with the BLM's determination of No Adverse Effect based on monitoring by a qualified archaeologist.

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	Christine Cimiluca, Acting Botanist
	X	Daniel Emmett, 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: No new surface disturbance is required for the Proposed Action (surface flowline) and the project would be conducted entirely within an existing right-of way. Section 7 consultation is not required. A survey was conducted for all TES species on 9/17/2013. Suitable habitat was present, but no individual plants or populations were located.

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	David Gordon, 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	David Gordon, 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	Leticia Neal, 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	David Gordon, 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.

Section 1.2 Preparer Information

AUG 2 8 2014

Jerry Kenczka,
Assistant Field Manager

Date