

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Little Snake Field Office
455 Emerson Street
Craig, CO 81625

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2009-0116-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: COC49461 and pipeline ROW COC074400

PROJECT NAME: F. Wilson Well #37 and pipeline.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: NWNW Sec. 15, T12N, R100W, 6th P.M. in Moffat County

APPLICANT: Wexpro Company and Questar Gas Management Company

A. Describe the Proposed Action

The proposed action would be to approve one Application for Permit to Drill (APD) submitted by Wexpro Company. Wexpro Company proposes to drill one gas well on BLM administered land located in the Hiawatha Field in Sec. 15, T12N, R100W. An APD has been filed with the LSFO for F Wilson Well #37, formerly Hiawatha Deep Well #6. The APD includes drilling and surface use plans that cover mitigation of impacts to vegetation, soil, surface water, and other resources. Mitigation not incorporated by Wexpro Company in the drilling and surface use plans would be attached by the BLM as Conditions of Approval to an approved APD.

The proposed well is located approximately 50 miles southeast of Rock Springs, Wyoming. Construction work was already done for the Hiawatha Deep Well #6 and the estimated duration of drilling for the well would be 45 days, to begin the summer of 2010. A short access road would be constructed for the well. Total surface disturbance for road construction would be 34 feet and would disturb less than 0.1 acres. All road construction would be on lease and on BLM surface and would not require a federal Right-of-Way.

The proposed well pad would be cleared of all vegetation and leveled for drilling. Topsoil and native vegetation would be stockpiled for use in reclamation. Approximately 3.0 acres would be disturbed for construction of each well pad. This would include the 400' by 330' well pad, the topsoil, and subsoil piles. A reserve pit would be constructed on the well pad to hold drill mud and cuttings. If a well is a producer, cut portions of the well site would be backfilled and unused portions of the well site would be stabilized and re-vegetated. If a gas well proves unproductive, it would be properly plugged and the entire well pad and access road would be reclaimed.

Questar Gas Management Company did include plans for a gas sales pipeline with the APD.

Approximately 413 feet of new pipeline would be installed and connected to existing gas pipeline in the Hiawatha Field to service the well once production is established. The ROW would be 30 feet wide and would the disturbance would be 0.3 acres. All pipeline construction would be on lease and on BLM surface.

Total surface disturbance for the proposed action would be 3.4 acres

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Little Snake Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision (ROD)

Date Approved: April 26, 1989

- Draft RMP/EIS February 1986
- Final RMP/EIS September 1986
- Colorado Oil and Gas Leasing and Development Final EIS January 1991

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- Colorado Public Land Health Standards, Decision Record & Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment, March 1997.
- CO-100-2005-074EA
- Archeological Survey Report:
 - Survey ID: MF.LM.NR905
 - Title: WEXPRO HIAWATHA DEEP UNIT #6 WELL AND ACCESS ROAD CLASS III CULTURAL RESOURCE INVENTORY (05-WAS-609)
 - Author: ERICKSON, JAN
 - Date: 07/19/2005
 - Contractor: WESTERN ARCHAEOLOGICAL SERVICES FOR THE BLM CRAIG FIELD OFFICE
- Survey ID: MF.LM.NR141
 - Title: MOUNTAIN FUEL RESOURCES LATERAL #198 JUMPER LINE (12-00-86)
 - Author: HEAD, JAMES
 - Date: 09/11/1986
 - Contractor: WESTERN WYOMING COLLEGE FOR THE BLM - CRAIG DISTRICT

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document? Yes. The current proposed action was part of the proposed actions in the previously analyzed and approved in CO-100-2005-074EA.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with

respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values? Yes. CO-100-2005-074EA appropriately analyzed the environmental impacts and a range of alternatives that include the proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances? Yes. The proposed action would have no disproportionate impacts on minority populations or low income communities (E.O.12898) and the President’s Executive Order, signed 01/10/01, which mandates evaluation of effects of actions and agency plans on migratory birds.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? Yes. CO-100-2005-074EA methodology and analytical approach are appropriate to this proposed action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes. CO-100-2005-074EA analyzed the direct, indirect, and site-specific impacts of the area covered under this current proposed action.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes, although this DNA would only renew the APD and pipeline ROW for one on the three originally proposed locations analyzed in CO-100-2005-074EA

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes, the Notice of Staking is posted in the Little Snake Field Office for a minimum of 30 days before the Application for Permit to Drill is approved and issued to the applicant.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented	Initials/Date
Shawn Wiser	Natural Resource Specialist	Air Quality, Floodplains, Prime/Unique Farmlands, Surface Water Quality	SW 10/13/09
Robyn Morris	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Concerns	RWM 03/17/10
Louise McMinn	Realty Specialist	Environmental Justice	LM 10/06/09
Ole Olsen	Natural Resource Specialist	Invasive Non-native Species	SW 10/13/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec.	Sensitive Plants, T&E Plant	JHS 10/9/09
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Animal	DA 10/13/09
Marty O’Mara	Petroleum Geologist	Ground Water Quality	EMO 10/09/09

Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	DA 10/13/09
Kimberly Miller	Outdoor Recreation Specialist	WSA, W&S Rivers	KMM 10/05/09

STANDARDS:

Name	Title	Standard	Initials/Date
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Animal Communities	DA 10/13/09
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Special Status, T&E Animal	DA 10/13/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec	Plant Communities	JHS 10/9/09
Hunter Seim	Rangeland Management Spec	Special Status, T&E Plant	JHS 10/9/09
Desa Ausmus	Wildlife Biologist	Riparian Systems	DA 10/13/09
Shawn Wiser	Natural Resource Specialist	Water Quality	SW 10/13/09
Shawn Wiser	Natural Resource Specialist	Upland Soils	SW 10/13/09

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Signature of Lead Specialist _____ Date _____

Signature of NEPA Coordinator _____ Date _____

Signature of the Authorizing Official _____ Date _____

Note: The signed Conclusion on this document is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision.