

Posted: _____

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Kremmling Field Office
P.O. Box 68
Kremmling, CO 80459**

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

NUMBER: CO-120-2007-42-CX

PROJECT NAME: Praxair Water Monitoring Wells

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 9N., R. 79W., Sec. 22: S½NW¼

APPLICANT: Praxair, Inc.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: Praxair has proposed to install 3 groundwater monitoring wells as part of the soil and groundwater remediation of the septic leach field associated with the Praxair CO₂ facility. The State of Colorado is requiring the installation of the wells as part of the Praxair's corrective action plans. The purpose of the wells is to further determine the extent of the groundwater contamination and monitor the progress of the remediation.

The proposed location of the wells is beyond Praxair's current lease boundary and is located on the Bonanza Creek Inc. oil and gas lease on BLM-administered public lands. Bonanza has given permission for this proposal. No access roads or structures would be necessary for the installation and operation of the wells (see Attachment #1 for project map).

The wells would be no larger than 6" in diameter and extend to groundwater depth, which is estimated to be 8'-10' below ground surface. The wells would be installed by a driller using a Power Probe or auger. The wells would be constructed by PVC pipe and capped with a metal fitting. Groundwater would be sampled from the wells immediately after installation and then likely on a quarterly basis. Sampling would continue until the groundwater meets State of Colorado quality standards, and Praxair would be required to send BLM copies of all sampling results. At this time, the sampling program would not be expected to last longer than 2 years after well installation.

The well installation is currently proposed for the summer of 2007 and would take approximately two days. Subsequent sampling would be completed approximately one day per quarter. A temporary work area would only be required for the drilling rig, which would be adjacent to the well location.

After groundwater quality standards are met, the wells would either be abandoned or removed from the site. Prior to abandoning wells, Praxair must contact the Kremmling Field Office to determine if the wells are needed for additional groundwater monitoring. Abandonment of the wells would follow all state regulations for proper plugging procedures and all surface disturbances would require reseeding. If a road is created from the quarterly sampling, then it would have to be ripped prior to seeding.

PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The Proposed Action is subject to and has been reviewed for conformance with (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM 1617.3) the following plan:

Name of Plan: Kremmling Resource Management Plan (RMP), Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: December 19, 1984; Updated February 1999

Decision Number/Page: II-B-12 pg.14

Decision Language: Decision Language: Provide the opportunity to utilize public lands for development of facilities which benefit the public, while considering environmental and agency concerns.

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW: The Proposed Action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4, Number: (E) (19) “Issuance of short-term (3 years or less) rights-of-way or land use authorizations for such uses as storage sites, apiary sites, and construction sites where the proposal includes rehabilitation to restore the land to its natural or original condition.” None of the following extraordinary circumstances in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply.

| Extraordinary Circumstances | Yes | No |
|--|------------|-----------|
| 2.1 Have significant impacts on public health or safety | | X |
| 2.2 Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as 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; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas. | | X |
| 2.3 Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102(2)(E)]. | | X |
| 2.4 Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks. | | X |
| 2.5 Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. | | X |
| 2.6 Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually | | X |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects. | | |
| 2.7 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. | | X |
| 2.8 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. | | X |
| 2.9 Violate a Federal Law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. | | X |
| 2.10 Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898). | | X |
| 2.11 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). | | X |
| 2.12 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). | | X |

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

| Name | Title | Area of Responsibility | Date Review Completed |
|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Susan Cassel | Realty Specialist | Realty | 6/11/07 |
| Joe Stout | Planner and NEPA Coordinator | NEPA | 7/5/07 |
| Bill Wyatt | Archaeologist | Cultural | 6/25/07 |
| Paula Belcher | Hydrologist | Soil, Air Water | 6/11/07 |
| Megan McGuire | Wildlife Biologist | T&E | 6/26/07 |

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources: There were no sites or isolated finds, thus the project would be a no effect.

Native American Religious Concerns: Native American Consultation occurred June 11, 2007, and no comments have been received to date.

Threatened and Endangered Species: There would be no impacts to threatened or endangered species.

COMPLIANCE PLAN: The right-of-way would be inspected and monitored periodically during terms of the grant to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the grant. The right-of-way would also be inspected after any maintenance activities to determine compliance with and effectiveness of reclamation measures.

NAME OF PREPARER: Susan Cassel

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Joe Stout

DATE: 7/5/07

ATTACHMENTS:

- 1). Project map
- 2). Standard realty stipulations included with Rights-of-ways

DECISION AND RATIONALE: I have reviewed this CER and have decided to implement the Proposed Action.

This action is listed in the Department Manual as an action that may be categorically excluded. I have evaluated the action relative to the 12 criteria listed above and have determined that it does not represent an extraordinary circumstance and is, therefore, categorically excluded from further environmental analysis.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: /s/ David Stout

DATE SIGNED: 7/11/07