

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Errata**

July 20, 2001

Subject: Errata: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact, Horse Trap Natural Gas Project, Lincoln County Wyoming (June 2001)

Dear Reviewer:

Please make the following changes in the above referenced environmental assessment:

Page 4-18. Add the following section:

#### **4.4.5 Water Resources Cumulative Impacts**

Disturbance by the proposed project would be limited to that necessary and site specific control measures, management directives and regulations would be applied to avoid or minimize adverse impacts to water resources. Similar protection stipulations would be applied to development occurring on adjacent land. No mitigation measures or procedures other than those proposed by Condor (Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.10) and management direction contained in the RMP would be required to minimize cumulative impacts to water resources.

Page 4-18. Change 4.4.5 Mitigation Summary to 4.4.6 Mitigation Summary.

Page 4-19. Change 4.4.6 Residual Impacts to 4.4.7 Residual Impacts.

Page 4-23. Add the following section:

#### **4.5.5 Vegetation and Wetland Cumulative Impacts**

Current disturbance on the project area consists of two natural gas wells and the associated roads and pipelines. Aside from these developments the project area remains nearly unaltered except for numerous existing 2-track roads. Under the proposed action, disturbance would include 24 new wells and the associated roads and pipelines. This would result in only 1% of the project area (132 acres) being disturbed. This area of disturbance would be reduced to approximately 46.8 acres following reclamation of disturbed areas not needed for production operations. No more than 2% of any vegetation cover type would be disturbed (see Table 4-5).

This amount of vegetation loss would not be significant based upon the impact significance criteria presented in section 4.5.2.

No direct impacts of aquatic and riparian areas on federal lands are expected because current proposed project activities would avoid these areas. Some minor disturbance to riparian areas on fee surface associated with road and well pad construction is occurring. These disturbances have been authorized by the fee surface owner and are not resulting in long-term damage to the riparian areas. Provided that soil erosion mitigation measures are followed, no indirect aquatic and riparian impacts are expected. Cumulative impacts upon both vegetation and wetland resources would not be significant provided that all mitigation and avoidance measures are implemented.

Page 4-23. Change 4.4.5 Mitigation Summary to 4.4.6 Mitigation Summary.

Page 4-23. Change 4.4.6 Residual Impacts to 4.4.7 Residual Impacts.

Page 4-26. Add the following section:

#### **4.6.4 Range Resources Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts to range resources and other land uses would be limited to the combined effects of existing and proposed disturbance. Existing disturbance on the HTPA includes 12.7 acres associated with the existing access road and less than 2.5 acres associated with two existing wells. Past disturbances associated with oil and gas exploration and the gas transmission pipeline have been reclaimed and would not contribute to cumulative effects. Current noxious and invasive weed control measures have been effective (Wilde 2001). Based on the limited existing disturbance, cumulative impacts to range resources and other land use would be insignificant.

Page 4-26. Change 4.6.4 Residual Impacts to 4.6.5 Residual Impacts.

Page 4-35. Add the following section:

#### **4.7.5 Wildlife Cumulative Impacts**

Currently, two production wells exist on the project area with the associated service roads and pipeline facilities. The proposed action would result in the addition of approximately 24 new wells and their associated road and pipeline facilities. This development would result in a short-term loss of approximately 132 acres of habitat and 46.8 acres in the long-term. This is only a 1% loss of habitat in the project area, and within the larger geographic region this amount of reduction would not result in significant cumulative impacts. Oil/gas exploration and production operations near the HTPA include the Moxa Arch natural gas development project located about 18 miles east of the HTPA. Other oil/gas production operations in the vicinity include the East LaBarge natural gas development project, located about 30 miles north of the HTPA. A detailed discussion of oil/gas exploration and production operations in the vicinity of the HTPA, including an in-depth cumulative impacts analysis is provided in the Pinedale Anticline Oil and

*Decision Record, Horse Trap Natural Gas Project*

---

Gas Exploration and Development Project Draft EIS. This document is available for review at the Kemmerer Field Office.

Implementation of the proposed action would only minimally reduce the amount of habitat available for big game wildlife species. The area of mule deer crucial winter/yearlong range that would be disturbed under the proposed action is 0.03% of the that range type in the Wyoming Range Herd Unit. Similarly, only 0.05% of the mule deer winter range in the Wyoming Range Herd Unit would be disturbed under the proposed action. The area of elk crucial winter range that would be disturbed under the proposed action is 0.02% of that range type in the West Green River Herd Unit. The area of pronghorn spring/summer/fall range that would be disturbed under the proposed action is 0.003% of that range type in the Sublette Herd Unit. Similarly, only 0.004% of the pronghorn winter yearlong range in the Sublette Herd Unit would be disturbed under the proposed action. The area of moose yearlong range that would be disturbed under the proposed action is 0.005% of that range type in the Lincoln Herd Unit. Similarly, only 0.02% of the moose winter yearlong range in the Lincoln herd unit would be disturbed under the proposed action. All of the big game herd units cover large areas, and disturbance from activities in other portions of the units is likely. However, with implementation of mitigation measures outlined in the Wildlife Mitigation Plan (Appendix D), the impacts associated with the proposed action would not add much cumulative disturbance, and no significant cumulative impacts are expected.

Sage grouse utilize the project area and historic leks have been located. Sage grouse leks, nesting habitat, and winter habitat need to be protected from development. Sage grouse on the project area would not be significantly impacted from disturbance associated with the proposed action provided that mitigation measures outlined in the Wildlife Mitigation Plan (Appendix D) are followed. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts are expected.

Disturbance impacts upon waterfowl would be minimal because no significant impacts upon water or wetland resources are expected, provided that management direction and mitigation measures are followed. Therefore, no significant cumulative impacts are expected.

Provided that management direction and mitigation measures outlined in the Wildlife Mitigation Plan are followed, no significant cumulative impacts are expected for raptor species. The incremental increase in cumulative impacts due to the implementation of the Proposed Action is negligible for Canada lynx, gray wolf, grizzly bear, black-footed ferret, whooping crane, mountain plover, pygmy rabbit, great basin pocket mouse, common loon, American bittern, long-billed curlew, and Columbia spotted frog primarily due to lack of evidence of their occurrence on the project area. The remaining species, burrowing owl and bald eagle, have the potential to occur within the project area and may be affected incrementally as a result of the Proposed Action, but cumulative impacts are not likely to be significant provided that management direction and mitigation measures outlined in the Wildlife Mitigation Plan are followed.

Page 4-35. Change 4.7.5 Mitigation Summary to 4.7.6 Mitigation Summary.

Page 4-35 Change 4.7.6 Residual Impacts to 4.7.7 Residual Impacts.