

**UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
BAKERSFIELD FIELD OFFICE**

**Environmental Assessment**

**Holmes Western Oil Corporation  
Sundry to Install Power Poles and Flowlines for Idle Wells Pacific 7 and Pacific 12  
DOI-BLM-CA-C060-2016-0050-EA**

**Chapter 1. Purpose and Need**

**PURPOSE AND NEED**

Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to approve one (1) Sundry Notice of Intent submitted by Holmes Western Oil Corporation (HWOC) to install 587 feet of new 2 inch flowline and 596 feet of new 2 inch CVR line on 29 new pipe supports, two new power poles and three new anchors, as well as plug and remove existing pipeline located on the well pads; the project would occur on HWOC's federal Pacific mineral lease (CALA033068) in Section 32, T12N, R23W, SBBM. This project is located on federal lands containing subsurface minerals administered by the BLM. No new disturbance would result in association with the proposed project.

The purpose of the proposed action is to provide HWOC with the authority to install power poles and flowlines and remove existing pipeline in order to return idle wells Pacific 7 and Pacific 12 to production in the future to produce its federal mineral lease (CALA033068) and provide energy resources to the American public. The need for the proposed action is to respond to the Sundry Notice of Intent submitted by the applicant to conduct operations on public lands containing subsurface minerals administered by the BLM.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant federal and state laws and regulations. The purpose of this document is to disclose and analyze the environmental consequences that are anticipated from the installation of 2 flowlines, 29 pipe supports, 2 power poles, and 3 anchors in the Midway Sunset Oil Field.

**CONFORMANCE WITH BLM LAND USE PLANS**

The proposed action falls within the Decision Area of the Bakersfield Resource Management Plan approved on December 22, 2014. This plan has been reviewed, and it has been determined that the proposed action conforms with the land use plan, terms, and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1610.5. The proposed action and modifications were specifically provided for in the following land use plan decision:

[MM-O-1]: “Facilitate reasonable, economical, and environmentally sound exploration and development of leasable minerals while minimizing impacts to other resources.”

## **Relationship to Statutes, Regulations and Other Plans**

### Oil and Gas Laws and Regulations

The BLM manages lands that contain a number of extractable minerals including oil and gas. These minerals are managed in accordance with the *Mineral Leasing Act* of 1920, as amended; the *Mining and Minerals Policy Act* of 1970; the *Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Leasing Reform Act* of 1987; 43 CFR, Onshore Orders 1-8, NEPA; the *Energy Policy Act of 2005*; and other laws, regulations, orders, and also in accordance with all applicable state, county, and local laws and ordinances. BLM requires existing lessees to strictly adhere to all laws, regulations, and policies that govern oil and gas leases, while at the same time recognizing that existing leases grant the lessee certain rights. No additional requirements can be placed on an existing lessee that conflict with the rights already granted to the lessee.

Onshore Order No. 1 identifies the requirements necessary for approving proposed oil and gas exploration, development, and servicing wells on all Federal and Indian oil and gas leases. This includes all components required for the management of fluid minerals including: completed Form 3160-3, well plat, drilling plan, surface use plan, bonding, operator certificate, onsite inspection, processing, reclamation, and Sundries. Onshore Order No.1 also identifies processing timelines and valid period of approvals.

### Endangered Species Act

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) requires federal agencies to complete formal consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) for any action that “may affect” federally listed species or critical habitat. The ESA also requires federal agencies to use their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of endangered and threatened species.

BLM completed formal consultation with the FWS for the Bakersfield RMP; the proposed action is in accordance with provisions of the Bakersfield RMP Biological Opinion. Furthermore, if it is determined that a specific oil and gas project “may affect” listed species in Kern or Kings County, California, the action may be covered by the 2001 Oil and Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion (1-1-01-F-0063). Reinitiation of this consultation is not warranted because: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take has not been exceeded; (2) no new information has been revealed that would alter the analyzed impact of the agency action on listed species or critical habitat; (3) the agency action has not been modified in a manner that changes the effects considered in the opinion; (4) a new species has not been listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the proposed action; and (5) the term of the biological opinion is 15 years. Despite increased media attention, enhanced recovery techniques in California have not changed since 2001 and have not increased the level of oil and gas activities on federal mineral estate in California.

An applicant may choose or be required to complete separate formal consultation if a project is deemed out of scope with the 2001 Oil and Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion. This project is within the scope of the 2001 Oil and Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion, so separate consultation is not required. Due to the anticipated disturbance to potential listed species habitat,

including Western Kern County Kit Fox Core habitat, this project will be covered under the 2001 Oil and Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion and will be subject to compliance with its Project Specific Provisions.

#### Clean Air Act

The San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District has state air quality jurisdiction over the project area. Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) and regulations under 40 CFR part 93, subpart W, with respect to conformity of general Federal actions to the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) apply to projects within nonattainment and maintenance areas. Under those authorities “no department, agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government shall engage in, support in any way or provide financial assistance for, license or permit, or approve any activity which does not conform to an applicable implementation plan.” Under CAA 176(c) and 40 CFR part 93 subpart W, a Federal agency must make a determination that a Federal action conforms to the applicable implementation plan before the action is taken.

#### National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) requires agencies to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify historic properties that may be affected by an agency’s undertakings and take those effects into account in making decisions. The BLM process for implementing this NHPA requirement is set forth in the *State Protocol Agreement Among the California State Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the California State Preservation Officer and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer (2014)*.

#### Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act of 1977 establishes authority to regulate any action where pollutants may be discharged into waters of the United States. Section 303 of the federal Clean Water Act requires states to adopt water quality standards that “consist of the designated uses of the navigable waters involved and the water quality criteria for such waters based upon such uses.” In California, these water quality standards and the administrative policies and procedures for protecting state waters are disclosed in regional water quality control board basin plans. Hence, California’s basin plans serve as regulatory references for meeting both State and federal requirements for water quality control (40 CFR Parts 130 and 131). These basin plans establish standards for ground waters in addition to surface waters, unlike the federal program.

The Clean Water Act also established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, regulating point source discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States. Section 402 of the Clean Water Act provides that storm water discharges associated with industrial activity and construction must be authorized under a NPDES permit. Clearing, grading, and excavation projects that disturb more than one acre are required to obtain a NPDES storm water discharge permit under EPA regulations, though certain regulations such as 40 CFR parts 122.26 (a)(2), (e)(8), and (c)(1)(iii) codify exemptions for oil and gas operations. In California, oil and gas operations are not required to obtain a stormwater discharge permit (Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ) under the authority of the Clean Water Act and the Code of Federal Regulations. This does not exempt oil and gas

operations from section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which establishes the authority to issue permits for dredged or fill material.

In California, oil and gas operators are required to obtain a permit for waste discharges to land (Water Quality Order No. 2003-0003-DWQ). The State may exempt State Waste Discharge Requirements for drilling mud and cuttings from well drilling operations, provided that such discharges are to on-site sumps, do not contain halogenated solvents, and at the end of drilling operations the discharger either removes all wastes from the sump or removes all free liquid from the sump and covers residual solid and semisolid wastes, provided that representative sampling of the sump contents after liquid removal shows residual solid wastes to be nonhazardous (California Code of Regulations, Title 27 section 20090).

Also, the State may exempt specific aquifers from particular beneficial use designations if the aquifer meets certain criteria, such as high TDS, contamination, low yield, and regulation as a geothermal energy source or exemption for the purpose of underground fluid injection pursuant to 40 CFR, Section 146.4 (CRWQCB – CVR, 2004).

#### Safe Drinking Water Act

The Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) of 1974 regulates the nation's public drinking water supply to protect public health. SDWA authorizes the U.S. EPA to set national health-based standards for drinking water to protect against both naturally-occurring and man-made contaminants that may be found in drinking water. Also, the SDWA sets a framework for the Underground Injection Control (UIC) program to control the injection of wastes into ground water. California has received primacy to implement the SDWA and therefore oversees the UIC program. The UIC program provides for the protection of all aquifers containing formation waters with less than 10,000 milligrams-per-liter total dissolved solids (mg/l TDS). The State may exempt specific aquifers from particular beneficial use designations if the aquifer meets certain criteria, such as high TDS, contamination, low yield, and regulation as a geothermal energy source or exemption for the purpose of underground fluid injection pursuant to 40 CFR, Section 146.4 (CRWQCB – CVR, 2004). All proposed Class II injection wells must undergo a comprehensive review by the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources. Also, all injection projects must be reviewed annually: operators must demonstrate that the injection is confined to the intended zone and that mechanical integrity for the well has been maintained.

#### Resource Conservation and Recovery Act

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 establishes a regulatory structure for the management and disposal of solid and hazardous wastes. Solid wastes consist of any discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gaseous material resulting from industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations, and from community activities. Solid wastes include both hazardous and nonhazardous waste. A waste may be considered hazardous if it is ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or contains certain amounts of toxic chemicals. Subtitle C of the RCRA creates a cradle-to-grave management system for hazardous waste, governing the generation, transportation, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous wastes. Subtitle D regulates the management of nonhazardous solid waste, establishing minimum federal

technical standards and guidelines for state solid waste plans in order to promote environmentally sound management of solid waste.

Oil and gas exploration and production (E&P) wastes that are intrinsically derived from primary field operations are exempt from Subtitle C hazardous waste regulations, though Subtitle D, other federal regulations, and state regulations still apply. Exempt E&P wastes include any produced fluids or waste otherwise generated by contact with the oil and gas production stream during the removal of produced water or other contaminants from the product. Some specific E&P wastes designated as exempt include produced water, drilling fluids, drill cuttings, rig-wash, work-over wastes, and well completion, treatment, and stimulation fluids. Examples of non-exempt wastes include unused fracturing fluids or acids, waste solvents, used equipment lubricating oils, and caustic or acid cleaners.

## **ISSUES AND SCOPING**

Scoping was initiated internally with the Bakersfield Field Office staff. In addition, the project was posted on the BLM Bakersfield NEPA projects web list on February 24, 2016. A BLM Onsite Inspection was completed on February 26, 2016 by BLM Natural Resource Specialist Tiera Arbogast. During the onsite inspection, it was determined that negligent surface disturbance (less than 0.001 acres) would occur as a result of project completion, which is reaffirmed by Consulting Biologist Diane L. Mitchell's, Ph.D., January 29, 2016 *Sensitive Species Review Form*.

## **Chapter 2. Proposed Action and Alternatives**

### **ALTERNATIVE 1: PROPOSED ACTION**

The BLM proposes to authorize HWOC to install 2 flowlines, 29 pipe supports, 2 power poles, and 3 anchors, as well as plug and remove existing pipeline located on the well pads as described in the Sundry Notice of Intent received by BLM on February 11, 2016. Installation activities would occur on HOWC's federal Pacific mineral lease (CALA033068) in the Midway Sunset Oil Field, Section 32, T12N, R23W, SDBM. The Pacific lease is located southwest of Bakersfield, California, and can be accessed by Highway 33 and Kerto Road in Maricopa, California.

HWOC will use a "zero-impact" method for all installation activities; all activity will be limited to existing roads and well pads, or where necessary, crews will conduct activity with hands and feet. In addition to installation of 2 flowlines, 29 pipe supports, 2 power poles, and 3 anchors, HWOC will also plug and remove existing pipeline located on the well pads.

Mostly all pipeline and supports will be placed along existing roadways; a negligible section of pipeline and supports will be run through habitat. Two ramp-overs will be constructed where pipeline will cross existing roads. Any soil necessary for ramp-over construction will be

obtained from Vulcan Dirt, a dirt distributor located in close proximity to the Pacific lease, so as not to mix soil types.

### Project Design Features

The following design features were derived from stipulations/notices on the oil and gas lease, the Bakersfield RMP, the Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development, best management practices, and Consulting Biologist Diane L. Mitchell's, Ph.D., January 29, 2016 *Sensitive Species Review Form*.

1. Pipeline construction will be initiated and completed using “zero-impact” methods.
2. As close to the beginning of construction as possible, but not more than 14 days prior to construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a final pre-construction survey of the construction zone to insure the no special-status wildlife species have recently occupied the project site.
3. A biologist shall be present immediately prior to and during ground disturbing activities that have potential to impact sensitive species and their habitats to identify and protect potentially sensitive resources.
4. Project site boundaries shall be clearly delineated by stakes, flagging and/or rope or cord to minimize inadvertent degradation or loss of adjacent habitat during pipeline installation activities. HWOC staff and/or its contractors shall post signs and/or place fence around the site to restrict access of vehicles and equipment unrelated to project activities. HWOC shall consider the use of wildlife-proof barricade fencing (i.e. sediment fencing, etc.) to prevent wildlife from entering the portions of the project site.
5. An Environmental Awareness Training program shall be conducted to orient all employees involved in project activities in the field. The program shall consist of a brief presentation in which biologists knowledgeable of endangered species biology and legislative protection shall explain endangered species concerns. The program shall include a discussion of special-status plants and sensitive wildlife species. Species biology, habitat needs, status under Endangered Species Act, and measures being taken for the protection of these species and their habitats as a part of the project shall be discussed.
6. In order to avoid or reduce potential impacts to nesting migratory bird species, biologists will conduct preconstruction nesting surveys for these species in appropriate habitat during the appropriate nesting period for these species. Where active nests of these species are identified or suspected to occur during preconstruction surveys, a qualified biologist will establish the following buffer zone around nest sites, and no disturbance activities will occur within these buffer zones until young birds have fledged. Migratory bird species typically nest and rear young from February through August. In order to avoid and minimize impacts on migratory bird species, a 250-foot buffer will be established around active nesting sites when project activities will occur during their active nesting period. No project-related activities will occur within this zone. The buffer

area can be removed prior to August if a qualified biologist determines that all juveniles have fledged from occupied nests.

7. All project activities shall be confined to the approved project footprint, and within existing pre-disturbed access roads. No activities shall take place outside the BLM approved project site.
8. A project representative shall establish restrictions on construction-related traffic to approved construction areas, storage areas, staging and parking areas via signage. Off-road traffic outside of designated project areas shall be prohibited. Project-related vehicles shall observe a 15 mph speed limit in all project areas except on County roads and State and federal highways to avoid impacts to special-status wildlife species.
9. Hazardous materials, fuels, lubricants, and solvents that spill accidentally during project-related activities shall be cleaned up and removed from the project sites as soon as possible according to applicable federal, state and local regulations.
10. All equipment storage and parking during site development and operation shall be confined to the project site or to previously disturbed, off site areas that are not suitable habitat for listed species.
11. All excavated steep-walled holes or trenches in excess of three feet in depth left open for more than one (1) work day shall be provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or other material to prevent entrapment of endangered species or other animals. Ramps shall be located at no greater than 1,000 foot intervals (for pipelines etc.) and at not less than 45 degree angles. Trenches shall be inspected for entrapped wildlife each morning prior to onset of construction activities and immediately prior to the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled they shall be inspected thoroughly for entrapped animals. Any animals discovered shall be allowed to escape voluntarily without harassment before construction activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.
12. All construction pipes, culverts, or similar structures stored at the construction site overnight having a diameter of four (4) inches or greater shall be inspected thoroughly for wildlife species before being buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. Pipes laid in trenches overnight shall be capped. If during construction a wildlife species is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe shall not be moved or, if necessary moved only once to remove it from the path of construction activity, until the wildlife species has escaped. All burrows shall be flagged for avoidance.
13. All food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles or food scraps generated during construction or during subsequent operation shall be disposed of only in closed containers and regularly removed from the project site. Food items may attract wildlife species onto a project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.

14. To prevent harassment or mortality of wildlife species via predation, or destruction of their dens or nests, no domestic pets shall be permitted on the project site.
15. Use of rodenticides and herbicides is not permitted on the federal lease unless such use is approved on a case by-case basis by the BLM. This is necessary to prevent primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species using adjacent habitats or depletion of prey upon which sensitive wildlife may depend.
16. HWOC staff and/or its contractors should designate a specific individual as a contact representative between HWOC and all applicable federal, state and local agencies to oversee compliance with these avoidance and mitigation measures.
17. In the event of inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during project implementation, the BLM Field Office Archaeologist and the BLM Field Manager (661-391-6000) shall be immediately notified by personnel responsible for the project. All work at the site of discovery, and in any other locations where impacts may occur, shall cease until written approval has been issued by the BLM.

## **ALTERNATIVE 2: NO ACTION**

BLM would not approve the Sundry Notice of Intent submitted to install 2 flowlines, 29 pipe supports, 2 power poles, 3 anchors, and plug and remove existing pipeline on HWOC's federal Pacific mineral lease (CALA033068).

### **Chapter 3. Environment Analysis**

This chapter presents both the affected environment and environmental consequences, by resource, for each alternative.

#### **GENERAL SETTING**

The project site is located within an existing oil and gas lease administered by the BLM within the Midway Sunset Oil Field, which is currently developed as an active oil field. The project site and surrounding area is densely occupied by oil and gas wells, injection wells, dirt access roads, numerous above ground pipelines, and power lines.

#### **Biological Resources**

The project is proposed on BLM surface that occurs within a conserved lands wildlife corridor. This is locally referred to as "Green Zone," meaning the land is considered part of strategy for the recovery of listed species in the southern San Joaquin Valley.

Federally listed plant species in the southern San Joaquin Valley include Kern mallow (*Eremalche kernensis*), San Joaquin woolly-threads (*Monolopia congdonii*), California jewelflower (*Caulanthus californicus*), Hoover's woolly-star (*Eriastrum hooveri*; delisted in 2003 but covered under the 2001 Oil and Gas Programmatic BO), and Bakersfield cactus (*Opuntia basilaris* var. *treleasei*). Listed animal species include San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes*

*macrotis*), blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia sila*), giant kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys ingens*), and Tipton kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys nitratooides*). Additionally, this region contains the State listed San Joaquin antelope squirrel (*Ammospermophilus nelsoni*). Field surveys to identify the potential for the occurrence of these listed species in the general project area were conducted by Consulting Biologist Diane L. Mitchell, Ph. D. on December 7, 2015. A project-specific onsite inspection was completed by BLM Natural Resource Specialist Tiera Arbogast on February 26, 2016.

In general, the proposed project is dominated by non-native annual grasses. Vegetation occurring within and adjacent to the project site include red brome (*Bromus madritensis spp. rubens*), ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus ssp. rigidus*), red-stem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), matchweed (*Lippia nodiflora*), and common saltbush (*Atriplex polycarpa*). California jewelflower, and Bakersfield cactus are out of range in the project area and not expected to occur. California jewelflower is not known to naturally exist in Kern County, and Bakersfield cactus is endemic to a limited area of central Kern County in the vicinity of Bakersfield. No special-status plants were observed at the project site, nor were they observed in previous surveys of the area conducted by Consulting Biologist Diane L. Mitchell, Ph.D. In addition, no special-status plants have been recorded in the project area on the California Department of Fish and Wildlife California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB).

Project implementation is not likely to adversely affect Kern mallow, San Joaquin woolly-threads, California jewelflower, Hoover's woolly-star, and Bakersfield cactus.

Biological surveys found no evidence of Giant kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys ingens*) or Tipton kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys nitratooides nitratooides*) in the vicinity of the project site, nor were there any observations of San Joaquin antelope squirrel (*Ammospermophilus nelsoni*). CNDDDB records indicate that San Joaquin antelope squirrel, Blunt-nosed leopard lizard (*Gambelia sila*), and Burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*) are presumed extant within the Southwest section of Section 31, T12N, R23W, SDBM.

Blunt-nosed leopard lizard surveys were not conducted during biological review; however, this species is not likely to occur due to past intensive disturbance and scarcity of suitable burrows on the project site. In addition, no burrows will be impacted by this project.

The project site is located within the Western Kern County Kit Fox Core, however no known or potential San Joaquin kit fox dens were observed during field surveys. Also, no sign of this species was observed in the biological survey area.

There is no critical habitat for any threatened or endangered species on the project site or in the vicinity. The only species observed during surveys was the Black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*).

Project implementation is not likely to adversely affect Giant kangaroo rat, Tipton kangaroo rat, San Joaquin antelope squirrel, Blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Burrowing owl, or San Joaquin kit fox.

Adherence to all project specific Conditions of Approval will prevent any adverse impacts to sensitive and/or listed species in the project vicinity.

**RESOURCE OR ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS CONSIDERED BUT NOT ANALYZED:**

The following elements of the human environment were considered but determined to be either not present or unaffected by the alternatives and will therefore not be addressed further in this analysis:

<i>Environmental Element:</i>	<i>Reason not addressed:</i>
<i>Air Quality</i>	HWOC would utilize a “zero-impact” method during project implementation, which would limit pollutant emitting motorized equipment to an established system of roads. This method would also limit use of such equipment. Therefore, emissions from dust and mobile sources are below <i>de minimus</i> .
<i>Hazardous Materials</i>	No hazardous materials are to be removed or disposed of for the proposed project.
<i>Cultural Resources</i>	A cultural resources inventory was conducted for all locations that could be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project (BLM Cultural Resource Inventory Report #CA-160-C/V-963). A single historic period cultural site was determined to be within the area of potential effect for the project. This site was formally evaluated for NRHP eligibility and was determined to be ineligible (BLM Cultural Resource Inventory Report # 6000-2016-11). Therefore there will be no effect to historic properties.
<i>Environmental Justice</i>	There are no Environmental Justice populations on or near the project site.
<i>Essential Fish Habitat</i>	There is no essential fish habitat designated on or downstream of the project site.
<i>Farmlands, Prime or Unique</i>	Soils within the project site are not classified as Prime or Unique Farmlands.
<i>Floodplains</i>	There are no Floodplains within this proposed project site.
<i>Invasive, Non-native Species</i>	No new invasive or non-native species were found on the proposed project site.

<b><i>Environmental Element:</i></b>	<b><i>Reason not addressed:</i></b>
<i>Lands With Wilderness Characteristics</i>	Based on the Bakersfield Field Office Proposed RMP/FEIS, Map 2.8; the project area does not contain lands possessing or proposed to be managed for the protection of wilderness characteristics.
<i>National Landscape Conservation Systems Units: National Monuments, National Trails, Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers</i>	The project vicinity does not contain these NLCS units.
<i>Native American Values</i>	Tribal notification was conducted which described potential development within an area that includes the project location. There are no places of traditional cultural or religious importance within the project area.
<i>Recreation</i>	The proposed project is on federal land and therefore is open to recreation. However, it is within a heavily developed oil field and would not be anticipated for recreational use.
<i>Soils</i>	A negligible amount of soil disturbance (2.74 square feet) would occur. Also, soils in the vicinity are 2-5% slope and are not likely to pond or flood; project implementation is not likely to cause soil erosion due to water. Soils are assigned to wind erodibility group 5; soils in this group have moderately low potential for wind erosion.
<i>Water Quality</i>	No rivers, lakes or streams are located in close proximity to the proposed site.
<i>Wetlands/Riparian Zones</i>	There are no wetlands or riparian zones in the project site or buffer area.
<i>Wild Horses and Burros</i>	No wild horse and burro management units occur in the project area.
<i>Grazing</i>	This project is within a BLM grazing allotment. However, there is no new permanent disturbance with this project and therefore, no impacts to the grazing allotment.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Installation of 2 flowlines, 29 pipe supports, 2 power poles, and 3 anchors as well as plugging and removing existing piping in the Midway Sunset Oil Field would allow the return of idle wells Pacific 7 and Pacific 12 to production. Returning these wells to production would not result in adverse impacts, as the Midway Sunset Oil Field is densely populated with producing oil field infrastructure. Any new construction activity on the project site in the future is unlikely to

adversely impact air quality, biological resources, water quality, or other environmental elements considered but not further analyzed in this Environmental Assessment. Future construction activity will be permitted by BLM, and in conjunction, a thorough environmental effects analysis will be conducted for all projects on the federal Pacific mineral lease (CALA033068).

## **Chapter 4. Consultation and Public Involvement**

### **PERSONS, GROUPS, TRIBES AND AGENCIES CONSULTED**

#### **LIST OF PREPARERS**

Tiera Arbogast, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM  
Tamara Whitley, Archaeologist, BLM

#### **List groups, Tribes, individuals, agencies contacted**

Tiera Arbogast, Natural Resource Specialist, BLM  
Denis Kearns, Botanist, BLM  
Tamara Whitley, Archaeologist, BLM  
John Hodge, Assistant Field Manager-Minerals, BLM  
Dawna Melton, Engineering Technician, Holmes Western Oil Corporation  
Terry Destrampe, HES Manager, Holmes Western Oil Corporation

#### **Recipients of Native American Notification Letters**

Mr. Neil Peyron, Chairman, Tule River Reservation  
Ms. Kerri Vera, Environmental Department, Tule River Reservation  
Ms. Kathryn Montes-Morgan, Chairwoman, Tejon Indian Tribe  
Mr. Ruben Barrios, Chairman, Santa Rosa Rancheria  
Mr. Hector Lalo Franco, Cultural Resources Specialist, Santa Rosa Rancheria  
Ms. Shana Brum, Archaeologist, Santa Rosa Rancheria

### **SUMMARY OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

This project was listed on the California NEPA web list beginning on February 24 9, 2016.

**National Historic Preservation Act:** For the purposes of public notification and review, as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a description of this project was posted on the BLM public NEPA E-Planning project webpage. This description included a statement that indicated that this action has been determined to have no effect to historic properties. As required under the Protocol, this determination was posted for a period of 15 days. There was no response by the public to this decision.

## **Chapter 6. References**

BLM Cultural Resource Inventory Report # CA-C/V-160-963. Class III Inventory of 551 Acres for Holmes Western Oil company, Maricopa, Kern County, California. Arran Bell, Colin Rambo,

Russell Kaldenberg, ASM & Affiliates. 2014. On file at the Bureau of Land Management, Bakersfield Field Office and the San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center.

BLM Cultural Resource Inventory Report #6000-2016-11. Class III Inventory, 4 Acres, Section 32 and NRHP Evaluation of P-15-004526, Kern County, California, Russell Kaldenberg and Peter Carey, ASM & Affiliates. 2014. On file at the Bureau of Land Management, Bakersfield Field Office and the San Joaquin Valley Archaeological Information Center.

Bakersfield Resource Management Plan, December 2014.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board – Central Valley Region (CRWQCB – CVR), 2004. Water Quality Control Plan for the Tulare Lake Basin, Second Edition. Available at: [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/tlbp.pdf](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/tlbp.pdf)

San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) (online). 2010. Current District Rules and Regulations. Available at: <http://www.valleyair.org/rules/1ruleslist.htm>

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Services, 2007. Soil Survey of Kern County, California, Northeastern Part and Southeastern Part of Tulare County, California. Prepared by Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with the regents of the University of California. U.S. Government Printing Office, 2007.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), 2014. Bakersfield Resource Management Plan. U.S. Government Printing Office, December 2014.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 2004. Guidance Document Reasonable and Prudent Practices for Stabilization (RAPPS) of Oil and Gas Construction Sites. Prepared by Horizon Environmental Services, Inc. April 2004.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1998. Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2001. Revised Formal Consultation on the Oil & Gas Programmatic Biological Opinion in Kings and Kern Counties, California (1-1-01-F-0163). September 28, 2001.