APPENDIX B

SCOPING NOTICE

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Rock Springs Field Office
280 Highway 191 North
Rock Springs, Wyoming 82901-3447

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

In Reply Refer To:
Devon Drilling Proposal
1310 (040)

JAN 0 3 2008

Scoping Notice
Devon Exploratory Drilling Proposal

Dear Reader:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Rock Springs Field Office (RSFO) will be preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for two exploratory gas wells proposed by Devon Energy Production Company in the BLM RSFO within Sweetwater County, Wyoming (also known as the Baxter Natural Gas Exploratory Proposal). The two proposed wells are located in section 28, T. 13 N., R. 106 W. and in section 5, T. 14 N., R. 105 W., 6th Principle Meridian. The proposed locations lie within or near the Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) and the Sugarloaf Basin Special Management Area as identified in the Green River Resource Management Plan (October 1997). The intent of this exploratory drilling is to gather information to evaluate the oil and gas resource potential underlying the company's leases within this area.

This document serves as notice of the beginning of the environmental analysis process to fulfill the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The 30-day scoping period will begin on January 10, 2008, and end on February 10, 2008. If you are interested in participating in the process and have concerns, issues or alternatives you would like to see addressed, please respond by supplying your written or e-mail comments to:

Address: Jeromy Caldwell
Devon Drilling Proposal
Bureau of Land Management
Rock Springs Field Office
280 Highway 191 North
Rock Springs, Wyoming 82901

E-mail: rock_springs_wymail@blm.gov
(Please add "Devon Drilling Proposal" in the subject line)

Your comments are important and will be considered in the environmental analysis process. If you do respond, we will add your name to our mailing list, which will ensure you are informed of decisions resulting from our analysis process. Please note that public comments submitted for this scoping review, including names, e-mail addresses, and street addresses of the respondents will be available for public review and disclosure at the above address during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays.

Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish us to withhold your name, e-mail address, or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this plainly at the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Comments specific to this proposal that were submitted prior to this official 30-day comment period have been saved and will be used (unless otherwise directed) and do not need to be resubmitted.

If you have any questions regarding this proposal, your roles, or our responsibilities, please contact Jeromy Caldwell at (307) 352-0259 in Rock Springs, Wyoming.

Sincerely,

John MacDonald
Acting Field Manager

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

COMMENT SUMMARY & RESPONSES

Table C-1. Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals that Submitted Written Comments on the Scoping Notice

Letter #	From
1	Blake Wollman
2	Brian Kelly
3	Quin Bertagnolli, Blake Wollman, Rick Evans
4	Don Hartley
5	Biodiversity Conservation Alliance
7	Nancy Hilding
8	Jonathan Ratner
9	Joyce Corcoran
10	Willa Mullen
11	Susan and Roger Pierce
12	Dinda Evans
13	Lydia Garvey
14	Thomas La Point
14	Peggy La Point
15	Shelly Ellis
16	Kirsten Carlson
17	Bob Joel Laybourn
18	Sweetwater County Conservation District
19	Vermillon Ranch Limited Partnership
20	Margaret Garner
21	Deb Fierke
22	William P. Hauser
23	Daniel Dale
24	Mark Kronfuss
25	Carolyn Hazlett
26	Anita Brentlinger
27	Karl Kronfuss
28	Tina Dudic
29	Dallas Latham
30	Ashley Osborne
31	Gregory Ellis
32	John & Clara Blair
33	Bob Silver
34	Toni Ranta Vinson
35	Bill Spillman
36	Roney Jakeway
37	Alice Jakeway
38	Wyoming Game and Fish Department

Letter #	From
39	Kelly Souther
40	John Mulvihill, Carol Perterson
41	Governor Dave Freudenthal
42	Department of Environmental Quality
43	Trout Unlimited
44	Devon
45	Department of Environmental Quality
46	Alice Hindman
47	Wyoming Wildlife Federation
48	Biodiversity Conservation Alliance
49	Craig Thompson

Responses to Comments

Responses to comments are organized by responder and are numbered in the order received. Comment letters are available at the Rock Springs Office.

Table C-2. Comment Summaries and Comment Responses

ID #		Comment	Response
1	1	Opposes gas wells near Sage Creek Road and further south. Should not develop in areas where many residents recreate. The area should be protected from any development for our children and grandchildren.	Thank you for your comment. The BLM will ensure that mitigation measures to minimize potential impacts are implemented.
2	1	Commented on Devon's previous poor reclamation practices at other well sites.	Thank you for your comment. For this project the BLM will ensure that the requirements of the mitigation plan and other mitigation requirements from the RMP, Conditions of Approval, and the APD will be fully implemented.
2	2	Part of the proposed project is within a previously burned area causing problems with vegetation growth, erosion, and reclamation.	Mitigation measures will be undertaken to minimize additional disturbance. Best Management Practices, such as erosion control measures, will be implemented throughout the project. Also the well pad and access roads will be reclaimed as soon as they are no longer considered necessary.
2	3	The project will increase visibility and awareness of the area and will increase poaching.	Devon personnel and its contractors are prohibited from carrying weapons to the project area. Also the wells have been located to minimize them being viewed from area roads.
2	4	There is currently a lack of pipeline capacity, no pipelines available in the area, and therefore no market for the gas.	We agree that there is not currently any pipeline to carry the natural gas from the site, and there are limitations to the existing area sales pipelines. However there are no pipelines proposed under this proposal. The wells will be shut in or abandoned and the area reclaimed after completion.
2	5	This project is being pushed through prior to a change in administration.	Thank you for your comment. However we do not know of any information related to this claim.
3	1	The project is a bad idea, they are not for it, and would prefer to see drilling west of HWY 430.	Thank you for your comment. Devon has existing leases in this area. Based on the RMP, the BLM allows for oil and gas development in this area, with restrictions intended to minimize impacts to critical resources.

ID #		Comment	Response
4	1	After a site visit by a group of trail fans, it appears that the impacts to the Cherokee Trail have been minimized.	Prior to submitting the APD, Devon moved the north well pad to a location greater then one mile away for the Cherokee trail. Also based on 3-D modeling, they placed the well pad in a draw to avoid any visual obstruction to Cherokee Trail.
5	1	There is insufficient information on which to base detailed comments. Requests that the BLM circulate the EA/EIS for this project along with all connected actions, for subsequent public review and comment.	The Scoping Notice is not intended to provide detailed information about the project, but provides sufficient information for the public to understand the project, provide BLM comments, and otherwise participate in the NEPA process. The BLM hosted an on-site tour of the proposed project area on December 5, 2007. BLM resource specialists and Devon employees attended the tour in order to provide more detailed information and to address specific questions and concerns. A 10-day comment period (December 5-15, 2007) followed the tour and a second comment period (January 10-February 10, 2008) was also provided to the public. NEPA does not require EAs to be circulated for public review, when the public is invited to comment on the proposed action and meaningfully participate in the public process during the scoping period.
5	2	This project involving sensitive wildlife habitat merits more careful consideration and analysis than it would get with a cursory review and rapid approval. A full-scale EA at a minimum, and more likely an EIS is warranted.	A full EA has been carried out for this proposal. It included conducting an analysis of critical wildlife habitat to determine if the project had any significant impacts. Impacts to critical wildlife habitat will be avoided, where possible.
5	3	Concerned about negative impact to elk and mule deer migrating and critical winter habitat (references numerous relevant studies). Winter range area should be withdrawn from surface disturbance for oil and gas, and be leased only under “no surface occupancy” stipulations.	The imposition of new leasing stipulations is beyond the scope of this document and the pending proposal. Further, once issued, the BLM cannot unilaterally modify stipulations attached to a valid existing lease. In addition, the proposed project is not in a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) area. The south well has a Timing Limitation Stipulation (TLS) for critical winter habitat lasting from November 15 to April 30.

ID #		Comment	Response
5	4	The proposed project sites were both burned recently and might have better forage values, but an absence of cover, and remain important winter habitat for elk and mule deer.	Fire often improves forage quality for a number of years post-fire. The impact of reduced animal shelter from recent wildfires and increased risk of accelerated hunting season harvest has been evaluated.
5	5	Wellpads and roads should be sited outside crucial wildlife ranges. If they are sited within 0.6 miles of such ranges, seasonal closures should be put into effect for the life of the wells.	See response 5-3 about the critical winter range TLS for the south well. If other critical wildlife, such as raptor nests, is found during the analysis for this EA, they will receive the BLM and USFWS-required protections, if applicable.
5	6	Both proposed wellpad sites are near raptor nesting areas. BLM Timing Limitation Stipulations (TLS) that expire upon completions of well drilling and construction phases are insufficient to prevent significant impacts to nesting birds of prey, and should be extended for the life of the well.	The proposed well pad and access road for the North Well are not within the one-mile buffer of an active red-tailed hawk nest. The nest was observed during the on-site for the North Well. The BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish Department determined that the proposed access road and well pad site would not impact the red-tailed hawk nest.
5	7	Due to the potential impact to raptor nesting and foraging activities (potential impacts described), the BLM should establish minimum 1 mile buffers (2 miles for ferruginous hawks) around nest sites to exclude roads and wellpads. Seasonal restrictions are not sufficient and could still lead to nest abandonment.	The buffer sizes and seasonal restrictions are established under the RMP process. According to the Green River RMP the ferruginous hawk buffer is one mile and surface disturbing restrictions are in place from February 1st through July 31st.
5	8	To ensure ferruginous hawk persistence at nesting sites during times of low prey abundance, use large buffers within which ground disturbing activities are prohibited. Wyoming Game and Fish recommend one-mile nest buffers, free from human disturbance.	Refer to response 5.7
5	9	States that ferruginous hawks are among the most sensitive of raptor species to disturbance. Provides findings from studies on the negative impacts to ferruginous hawks from human activities, such as nest abandonment.	Thank you for the relevant information. It will be made use of as part of this EA process.
5	10	States that if the project moves forward under Timing Limitation Stipulations that expire after construction, significant impacts to raptors are likely throughout production phase.	The required buffers and seasonal restrictions will be adhered to. Under this proposal, no gas production is planned.

ID #		Comment	Response
5	11	Notes recent court decision on sage grouse listing. States that as a BLM-listed sensitive species, the BLM cannot approve actions which contribute towards listing the sage grouse. Provides information about the sage grouse decline in Wyoming	The BLM is aware of the potential for listing the sage grouse under the Endangered Species Act. As stated, the sage grouse is currently listed as a BLM Sensitive Species, and all the restrictions established under the RMP and BLM guidance documents will be followed. However, there are no sage grouse stipulations in or near the proposal area, because there are no sage grouse leks in the vicinity of the proposed well locations. One inactive sage grouse lek was recorded approximately four miles from the North Well. However, the Wyoming G&F has no records on when the lek was active.
5	12	Oil and gas development poses the greatest threat to sage grouse viability in the region. Provides information from studies on the potential impacts and management recommendations for sage grouse. Includes a recommendation that energy related facilities should be located >3.2 km from active leks. Describes how leks are like hubs from which nesting occurs.	Thank you for the relevant information. It was considered by the BLM during the the EA process. Further, both proposed drilling locations are located more than 4 miles from an active sage grouse lek.
5	14	Trout Creek and Sage Creek are both trout fisheries and Trout Creek is a potential Colorado River cutthroat trout (CRCT) reintroduction area. Due to potential erosion from highly erodible soils, saline soils, and from recently burned areas potentially impacting trout habitat, the BCA recommends that roads and wellpads not be on slopes greater the 15 %, or on unstable, highly erodible or saline soils, that 404 permits be required for stream channel crossings, and that construction standards be in place to prevent erosion.	Thank you for the relevant information on the CRCT. It was considered in preparation of this EA. We agree that erosion to area trout streams is a significant concern. The BLM will take measures to mitigate the potential of sediment reaching area surface waters. For example, under the RMP, stormwater BMPs are required. In addition, the BLM has required that Devon implement a closed loop fluid management system, so no reserve pit will be constructed. There are no stream crossings in this proposal.
5	15	The BLM should survey for presence and population density of the blue-gray gnatcatcher and other sagebrush obligate songbirds. The BLM should assess the potential presence of and impacts to BLM Sensitive Species and other sensitive species.	The EA process involves analyses based on available data; additional data collection such as wildlife surveys is rarely done. The BLM has assessed in this EA, the potential presence and impacts to BLM Sensitive Species and sagebrush-obligate songbirds.

ID #		Comment	Response
5	16	The BLM should examine the extent to which permitted activities cause the spread of cheatgrass and halogeton, and should have in place permit conditions to minimize it spread. A weed survey should be done at the drilling site.	The EA process involves analyses based on available data. The BLM has required a weed management program for this project that includes weed monitoring and treatment.
5	17	Avoid sitting facilities in the viewsheds of trails or sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Tribes should be consulted to ensure protection of cultural resources. Trained archeologists and paleontologists should clear roads, pads and their viewsheds.	Prior to the initiation the EA, Devon and the RSFO examined the location of the well pads and roads with regard to potential impacts to the Cherokee Trail. Based on these pre-proposal analyses, the north well pad was moved more than a mile away for the Cherokee trail to avoid any visual obstruction to Cherokee Trail. A cultural survey has been conducted by trained professionals to clear the project area. No cultural sites eligible for the National Register of Historic Places were found in the proposal area.
5	18	The NEPA EA should include all connected actions to this project, including gathering and transport pipelines, and the potential for additional pipelines.	There are no pipelines proposed or planned for with this project.
5	19	BLM must consider the cumulative effects of this project on wildlife that are impacted by other nearby oil and gas developments, highways, powerlines etc. Cumulative and direct impact analysis should also examine the combined effects of this and other projects on the Trout and Sage Creeks water resources.	Cumulative impacts to wildlife and to area watersheds were evaluated in Section 4.21 (Cumulative Impacts) of this EA.
5	20	The Visual Resource Management classification for the site was not listed in the NOS. BLM should ensure wells are sited in areas to screen them from recreation roads and areas.	The VRMs and the management requirements for the project area are included in the RMP. Some visual mitigation actions were taken during a pre-proposal analysis with the BLM and Devon, and adjustment made to minimize impacts to visual resources. The two proposed wells and access roads are in areas classified as VRM III. The approval of the Baxter Project conforms with the existing VRM Objectives in the Green River RMP.

ID #		Comment	Response
7	1	This project is going into an area currently without oil and gas development. This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey, ferruginous hawks, and trout in Sage and Trout Creek. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly, and the impacts minimized.	The proposed gas wells are the only oil or gas wells in the immediate area. However, based on the RMP, the BLM allows for oil and gas development in the areas of the well sites, with restrictions intended to minimize impacts to critical resources. The potential impacts to the resources listed have been analyzed as part of the EA, and those impacts will be minimized to meet all relevant regulations.
7	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	The BLM provided hosted an on-site tour of the proposed project area on December 5, 2007 followed by a 10-day comment period. Based on requests for more time to comment on the scoping notice, the BLM added a 30-day public comment period. NEPA does not require EAs to be circulated for public review when the public is invited to comment on the proposed action and meaningfully participate in the public process during the scoping period.
8	1	Asks to be added to the NEPA list for the Little Mountain project.	The commenter has been added to the mailing list for the Baxter EA Proposal.
9	1	Opposed to this project. States that some places should not be touched, and the project area is in a valuable tourism and outdoor activities area.	We appreciate your comment and concern. Mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize impacts to recreation and tourism.
9	2	Considers this area to be sacred, and that the economic and spiritual values of the untouched area outweigh the economic impact of drilling. States that the WY Council of Churches advocates the preservation and conservation of the Red Desert.	We appreciate your comment and concern. However, in the Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek ACEC, development is allowed. Mitigation measures will be implemented to minimize impacts in order to preserve the Red Desert to the extent possible.
10	1	Requests that the BLM do a thorough EIS on this project, with special attention to the area big game herds. The strongest protections should be in place if the project goes forward.	The BLM determined that for this two well exploratory proposal an EA is the correct NEPA process to follow.
10	2	Requests that the BLM extend the public comment period. There has not been enough time for the public to respond to the potential impacts, and it is important that the public have this opportunity.	Please refer to response 7.2.

ID #		Comment	Response
11	1	This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey including the ferruginous hawk, and trout in Sage and Trout Creeks, a priority area for reintroduction of CRCT. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	The potential impacts to the fish and wildlife resources have been evaluated in the EA, and those potential impacts will be minimized. For example, there is a critical winter range timing stipulation in the area of the south well from November 15 through April 30.
11	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	Please refer to response 7.2.
12	1	Impacts to elk and mule deer herds, nesting birds of prey, including the ferruginous hawk, should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 11.1
12	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	Please refer to response 7.2.
13	1	It is inappropriate to destroy this wilderness area. Do your job; protect our public lands, waters, and wildlife.	Thank you for comment and concern. No designated wilderness areas or wilderness study area fall within the project area. The BLM will implement mitigation measures it believes are necessary to protect land, wildlife, and water resources.
14	1	There is enormous potential for serious environmental damage and a project of this importance should not be undertaken so lightly and behind closed doors.	The EA evaluated the potential impacts and identified mitigation measures to be implemented to prevent any serious environmental damage. Note that two public comment periods were held for this EA. Please also refer to response 7.2.
14	2	Disappointed that this project will go forward without an EIS or public input. The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. Urges that the comment period should be extended for at least another month	Please refer to response 7.2.

ID #		Comment	Response
15	1	Opposed to this project. This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey, ferruginous hawk, and trout in Sage and Trout Creek a priority area for of CRCT reintroduction. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 11.1
15	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	Please refer to response 7.2.
16	1	Urges that the project be opened to public comment. Opposed to this project. This project is likely to ruin elk and mule deer winter habitat, and affect CRCT and birds of prey habitat.	Please refer to response 7.2 and 11.1
16	2	These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 14.1
17	1	Assessment to land and wildlife must be made before the exploratory drilling. Extend the comment period.	Please refer to response 7.2 and 11.1
18	1	Reminds the BLM and Devon of the need to closely coordinate project implementation and reclamation with the District and affected livestock operators (per state and federal law).	Your comment has been taken into account in the EA, and the BLM is committed to coordinating with the SWCCD, as appropriate.
18	2	Given that this project will likely lead to additional gas wells in the area, it is particularly important that the BLM and Devon coordinate with SWCCD on noxious weed control, wildlife habitat, and livestock mitigation.	At this time there are no plans for additional gas wells in the area. The BLM is committed to coordinating with the SWCCD and area livestock allotment holders, as appropriate.
18	3	The EA should address any anticipated impacts to livestock grazing allotments, range resources, and include appropriate mitigation measures per NEPA requirements.	Impacts to the listed resources have been addressed in this EA, and appropriate mitigation measures put in place.
19	1	Supports the SWCCD call for the BLM and Devon to closely coordinate project implementation and reclamation with the District and affected livestock operators (including Vermillon).	Please refer to response to 18.1 and 18.2.

ID #		Comment	Response
19	2	The bigger issue of energy development in this area raises concerns regarding reclamation, weeds, and livestock grazing. Vermillion requests that it have the opportunity to coordinate and work with Devon in addressing well and road reclamation techniques.	Please refer to response to 18.2.
19	3	With the likely expansion of the project, Vermillion believes that it can be a valuable partner in the mitigation planning	Thank you for your comment. The BLM will consider your request.
20	1	These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized. Soil erosion could negatively affect native fish, and drilling could disrupt elk, mule deer and ferruginous hawks.	Please refer to response 7.2 and 11.1
21	1	The public comment period is too short and unacceptable for a project that can impact area wildlife. The comment period needs to be extended.	Please refer to response 7.2.
21	2	Takes annual family hunting trips to the area, and takes pride in being able to enjoy the pristine and clean area.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area.
22	1	The public comment period is too short and unacceptable for a project that can impact area wildlife. The comment period needs to be extended.	Please refer to response 7.2.
22	2	Takes annual family hunting trips to the area, and takes pride in being able to enjoy the pristine and clean area.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area.
23	1	These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 11.1.
23	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended.	Please refer to response 7.2 and 11.1.
24	1	There is not enough time to public comment, it is not practical and is an unconscious rush on such a matter.	Please refer to response 7.2.
25	1	This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey, ferruginous hawks. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Impacts to the identified resources have been addressed in the EA. Please also refer to response 11.1.

ID #		Comment	Response
25	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	Please refer to response 7.2.
25	3	Please explain why the BLM seems so partial to big oil, gas, and timber companies.	The BLM's mission is to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations. As part of this mission the BLM has a multiple-use management mandate that includes responsible development of the resources listed.
26	1	Asks that the BLM take the time to give citizens the information on the long-term effects the project will have on wildlife.	The Final EA is available to the public. An analysis on the potential impacts to wildlife and required mitigation measures for wildlife were addressed in the EA.
27	1	Pursuant to 5 USC section 555 e, the commenter formally petitions the BLM to extend the comment period, and to circulate the NEPA analysis for public comment prior to issuing a decision.	Please refer to response 7.2. While it is not required to hold a public comment period on the Draft EA, the BLM has considered this option.
28	1	Requests a public comment period before decisions are made.	Please refer to response 27.1
29	1	Disagrees with the project. Wildlife habitat would suffer if drilling is done, and that would be a loss to visitors.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area. The potential impacts to the fish and wildlife resources have been evaluated as part of the EA, and those potential impacts will be minimized to the extent required.
29	2	There are already too many areas destroyed that would take years to recover, if at all.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area. Mitigation and reclamation measures will be required in order to minimize the impacts to area resources, and to restore the site to its natural state as soon as the project is completed.
30	1	No, to this project. Asks if we haven't destroyed enough land yet. Talks about the oil as a problem and that Wyoming is about other things like peace and happiness.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area. Your objection to the project has been noted.
31	1	This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey, ferruginous hawks. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 11.1

ID #		Comment	Response
31	2	The public deserves a chance to see what the impacts will be and to comment on that information. This is an important project, and the comment period should be extended to allow the public a real chance to comment.	Please refer to response 7.2.
32	1	Finds it wrong for the BLM to consider this project. Wells are planned in crucial big game winter ranges, in an area without wells, and high density drilling is likely to follow.	Thank you for your comment. Mitigation and reclamation measures will be required in order to minimize the impacts to area resources and to recover the site to a natural state as soon as the project is completed. There are no current plans for further drilling in the area.
32	2	Opposed to this project. This project is likely to impact elk and mule deer herds, birds of prey, ferruginous hawks, and trout in Sage and Trout Creeks a priority area for of CRCT reintroduction. These potential impacts should be studied thoroughly in an EA or EIS, and the impacts minimized.	Please refer to response 11.1
32	3	The BLM should circulate a complete assessment with significant time for public comment.	Please refer to response 7.2 and 11.1
33	1	States that wildlife impacts from drilling rigs is minimal, that the real issue is that many do not want the drilling rigs disturbing wildlife during hunting season.	Thank you for your comment.
34	1	Expressed distress over opening the area for drilling. States a need to preserve area for wildlife and recreation.	Please refer to response 32.1
35	1	States that this is a formal protest to the BLM plan to allow drilling in the Little Mountain area. States that this is one of the last areas in region not already drilled, that there will be impacts to wildlife, recreation, and local quality of life, and that short-terms gains do not outweigh long-term impacts.	Your objection to the project has been noted. Please refer to response 7.1.
36	1	Considers this one of the last pristine areas in Wyoming. Drilling will destroy this special spot and the exceptional hunting. Asks to stop exploratory drilling in the area.	Your objection to the project has been noted. Please refer to response 7.1.
37	1	A reason she loves the area is because of the beauty and wildlife around Little Mountain. Any drilling will destroy that; please leave the area alone.	Thank you for your comment and concern for the area. Your objection to the project has been noted.

ID #		Comment	Response
38	1	South well is in critical winter range for mule deer herd. North well is adjacent to crucial range for both mule deer and elk herds. Could cause impacts to big game, including elk parturition areas, and crucial winter ranges.	This environmental assessment is only for the two proposed wells and does not include any reasonably foreseeable development following drilling of these wells. No additional drilling or development activities have been proposed.
38	2	Area is very popular for recreation, hunting, and wildlife viewing. One of the most popular hunting areas in the State. High interest in maintaining big game levels.	The BLM is acutely aware of the high recreation value of the area. Its importance for recreation has been addressed in the environmental consequences section of the EA.
38	3	There are many SGCN (species of greatest conservation need), raptor species, and wetland obligate species documented in the area. Two of the SGCN species are being considered for the ESA listing.	The impacts of the proposed two-well exploratory drilling project to species of greatest conservation need (SGCN), including the pygmy rabbit, greater sage-grouse, and midget faded rattlesnake, has been evaluated in the environmental consequences section of the EA.
38	4	There are several major drainages in the area, with sensitive species present, primarily the CRCT. The Green River Region is the number one habitat priority for the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WG&FD).	Trout and Sage Creeks are important habitats of the Colorado River cutthroat trout, a species of high recreational value. As a result, the BLM has determined that a closed loop system for drilling the two exploratory wells is required.
38	5	Given the no surface occupancy and right of way restrictions in the Currant Creek watershed, the Sage Creek watershed, and the Sugarloaf Basin area it would be impossible for fluid mineral development in these areas to be in compliance with the RMP.	The Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek ACEC allows for surface-disturbing activities. The Greater Red Creek ACEC is, however, a rights-of-way and surface disturbing activities avoidance area, where actions are considered and analyzed on a case-by-case basis, and may result in limiting the number of roads or other construction activities. Therefore, the proposed action is in conformance with the Green River RMP (BLM 1997).
38	6	The project area is in the Little Mountain/Red Creek Watershed Improvement area. The goal is to improve habitat through an integrated approach. Collaborative restoration activities are ongoing, with $1.44 million spent so far.	The BLM is acutely aware of the high level of funding provided for the Little Mountain/Red Creek Watershed Enhancement Project by private landowners, environmental organizations, and agencies, including the BLM. As a result this two-well exploratory project is being closely monitored by the BLM to minimize the potential of impact to this watershed.

ID #		Comment	Response
38	7	Energy development in the Little Mountain area is not compatible with ongoing ecosystem restoration efforts. Full field development would compromise the integrity of the local ecosystem, and produce irreparable impacts.	The proposed project only includes the exploration of two wells by Devon. No other development is being considered nor has additional development been proposed at this time. Any additional development would require compliance with NEPA.
38	8	Proposed project development would not contribute positively toward meeting RMP management objectives for the ACEC and SMA, and could have negative consequences to wildlife (objectives listed).	The purpose of this EA is to evaluate the potential impact of drilling two exploratory wells. No further development is being considered at this time. The BLM does not propose any activities that are not in compliance with the Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek ACEC and Sugarloaf Basin Special Management Area, as specified in the Green River RMP (BLM 1997).
38	9	This project would conflict with established management objectives, and given the unique nature of the area, development should be preceded by a full EIS analysis.	As indicated above, the proposed action involves drilling two exploratory wells. Any further development, if proposed by Devon, would require additional NEPA compliance, likely a full EIS analysis, as suggested by this commenter.
38	10	After an 80,000 acre fire, the area remains susceptible to invasive weed infestation. New roads, wells pads, etc will provide a stronghold for invasive weed establishment.	Devon has committed to developing a detailed reclamation plan that would prevent the establishment of invasive vegetation in the area disturbed by the two well pads and new access roads.
38	11	Increased sedimentation resulting from road traffic will negatively impact the adjacent aquatic assemblages including the CRCT and mountain sucker.	Silt fences and other Best Management Practices will be used to prevent soil erosion from occurring and reaching the nearby creeks that are habitat to the Colorado River cutthroat trout and other aquatic species. For construction, drilling and completion activities, Devon would apply dust suppressants, as needed, to BLM and County roads to reduce fugitive dust from vehicle traffic.
38	12	Increased road traffic and road densities will increase wildlife mortalities.	Although traffic will increase during construction and drilling of the two exploratory wells, speed limits on all county roads and access roads will be strictly enforced. In addition, all workers using the roads will be trained to be alert for and avoid all wildlife, including big game species and SGCN species.

ID #		Comment	Response
38	13	Recommends that the proposed project and future exploratory actions be pursued under the RMP. If development cannot proceed under the RMP, recommend re-purchase of the leases and withdraw area from future leasing.	The proposed action has been determined by the BLM to be in conformance with the management direction in the Green River RMP (BLM 1997).
38	14	Drilling, testing, and other activities should be done outside of wildlife stipulation periods. Recommends that no big game winter range exceptions be granted.	Devon will avoid drilling during the winter stipulations for big game species. In addition, the BLM will not grant exemptions to the timing limitation stipulations in the crucial big game winter ranges.
38	15	Avoid development activities during the archery and rifle seasons in September and October.	Devon will attempt to complete drilling prior to the hunting season.
38	16	Discourage vehicle traffic at dawn and dusk and require busing for workers to avoid vehicle/big game collisions.	Devon has agreed to minimize traffic at dawn and dusk to avoid collision with big game species
38	17	Discourage tent and trailer camping to avoid wildlife and habitat disturbance and do not allow firearms at the project site to reduce poaching.	During drilling, three workers are required to be at the project site at all times. Therefore, a trailer will be necessary for that time period. At no time will tents be allowed. Devon has a policy that prohibits any worker from bringing firearms to the project area. Anyone found with firearms will face disciplinary action, including immediate dismissal.
38	18	Recommends avoidance or mitigation of potential impacts to red-tailed hawk and ferruginous hawk nest sites near well #16-5-14-105	The proposed well pad and access road for Well #16-5-14-105 are not within the one-mile buffer of an active red-tailed hawk nest, which was observed during the on-site for this well. The BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish Department determined that the access road and the proposed well pad site would not impact the red-tailed hawk nest.
38	19	Recommends that the BLM utilize management and mitigation practices listed in the WG&FD Appendix B and C of "Recommendations for Development of Oil and Gas Resources within Crucial and Important Wildlife Habitats".	The BLM intends to implement the management and mitigation practices identified in Appendix B and C of the Wyoming G&F department document mentioned.
38	20	Looks forward to providing specific input at each phase of the project, and continued effective long-term management of key wildlife species.	The BLM appreciates the input of the Wyoming Game and Fish Department to provide guidance and assistance in effective long-term management of this key wildlife area.

ID #		Comment	Response
39	1	Expresses concern about the impacts from oil and gas, and believes some areas should be off limits, believes that a slash and burn policy is wrong.	Thank you for your comment. The proposed North Well is located in the Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek ACEC, which allows for Controlled Surface Use. The South Well will be located in the Sugarloaf Basin Special Management Area. Closed loop drilling is being required by the BLM to protect this important groundwater recharge area.
40	1	Concerned about the destruction visited upon the area from oil and gas development.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 32.1
40	1	Concerned about the impact to wildlife from oil and gas impacts. States that further oil and gas development should be denied.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 32.1
41	1	If the two wells are successful there is expected to be a major gas resource play on the southwest flank of the Rock Springs uplift characterized by well spacing of 5-10 acres. States that he does not want the Baxter Proposal to trigger the full industrialization of an irreplaceable recreation area and fragile ecosystem.	There is no further development planned until results of exploratory wells are evaluated. This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planed. If large scale gas field development is proposed an EIS would be conducted.
41	2	States that it is not just the beachhead for a large production unit, but that the two proposed wells present serious problems according to WG&FD	Please refer to response 41.1
41	3	States that the area is a premier trophy hunting area, and that it is uniquely important place locally, statewide, and regionally. One well is within a crucial winter range for both the South Rock Spring mule deer and elk herds.	The BLM will work toward minimizing impacts to big game species, to hunting activities, and to critical winter range. The south well is in a no disturbance critical winter range area. The north well was moved to avoid an elk calving area. There is currently no production planned. The wells will be either abandoned and reclaimed, or shut in as soon as work is completed.
41	4	Together private entities, state and federal agencies have invested approximately $1.44 million in ecosystem restoration projects in the area since 1990.	The BLM acknowledges the significance of the restoration work carried out in the Little Mountain area to date, and commits to mitigating potential impacts from this project to fish and game habitat in the proposal area.

ID #		Comment	Response
41	5	Approximately 80,000 acres have burned in the area in the last seven years. The area is at a critical moment in terms of preventing invasive plant species, such as cheatgrass from taking hold and spreading.	Burn areas are particularly prone to noxious weed infestations, especially cheatgrass. The most recent burn was in 2000, which burned the area where the North Well is proposed. Since then the vegetation has re-established itself. The BLM requires the applicant to develop and implement a weed control plan in order to minimize the potential for noxious weed infestations.
41	6	According to the WG&FD the proposed project is out of compliance with the habitat resource protections of the BLM Green River Resource Management Plan (RMP). That it would be impossible to allow fluid minerals development in these areas and remain in compliance the RMP.	The Sage Creek watershed portion of the Greater Red Creek ACEC is open for mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities with appropriate mitigation requirements applied to protect the other important resource values. Other portions of the ACEC are in NSO areas and/or have had mineral leases withdrawn.
41	7	The Little Mountain ecosystem is home to 37 species listed in the WY Comprehensive Wildlife Conservations Strategy as species of greatest conservation need, including the sage grouse and pygmy rabbit.	Thank you for the information. As required by the RMP, BLM consultation with the WGFD will occur, as needed, for State listed species of greatest conservation need. BLM will cooperate with the WGFD in preparation of studies for the introduction and re-introduction of CRCT. Many of the State species of greatest conservation need overlap with the BLM sensitive species list for the area, which will be evaluated for this EA.
41	8	Wyoming has taken state-wide efforts to preclude the ESA listing of the sage grouse. Any action that could affect the sage grouse will increase ESA scrutiny. Wants to make sure that the future ability to make land use decisions is not placed at risk.	The BLM is aware of the potential listing of the sage grouse. The sage grouse is currently listed as a BLM Sensitive Species, and all the restrictions established under the RMP and other BLM guidance documents will be followed in the conservation of the grouse. However, there are no active sage grouse leks within several miles of the proposed drilling locations.

ID #		Comment	Response
41	9	The Little Mountain ecosystem supports aquatic species of greatest conservation need including the CRCT, and has been identified as the number one aquatic habitat priority area of the Green River region.	The RMP identifies many of the watersheds around Little Mountain as priority areas for the protection of watershed functions needed for a proper functioning aquatic and riparian systems necessary for a healthy CRCT fishery. Based on the requirements listed in the RMP, the applicant will be required to comply with the management objectives of protecting watershed health. The BLM has required use of a closed loop fluid management system during the drilling operations to protect the watershed.
41	10	Water handling methods must be accounted for, and possible impacts to surface water quality should be assessed in light of extensive energy development on the general area.	A closed loop fluid management system will be used during the drilling operations. All fluids used or produced during the drilling and completion operations will be stored in tanks and taken off-site to an approved waste handling operation. An assessment of the potential for the closed loop and other water related issues to impact surface and ground water has been carried out in the EA.
41	11	A baseline air quality assessment ought to be established prior to any activity. Potential large scale development may lead to the EPA's more strict ozone standards coming into play.	The BLM acknowledges that a baseline air quality assessment is important and should be conducted for an EIS prior to any full scale development approval.
41	12	Lists a series of other issues that have to be accounted for in future project documentation, including weed control, soil erosion, reclamation, air quality, socioeconomic impacts, water availability, transportation, new infrastructure, energy demands, and cumulative impacts.	Weed control, soil erosion, reclamation, air quality, socioeconomic impacts, water availability, transportation, new infrastructure, and cumulative impacts has been evaluated in this EA.
41	13	Energy development in the Little Mountain area will evoke strong reactions and bring up many issues that reflect the importance of the area to the locals. This project will require an EIS. Urges the BLM to carefully weigh if the impacts from this project are manageable.	There have been extensive public comments on this project that reflect local concern about potential impacts form mineral development to the area. However, this project involves two exploratory wells and the BLM has determined that an EA is the appropriate NEPA process. If large scale future development is proposed, an EIS is likely which would involve much more detailed analysis and assessment.
42	1	Lists the type of water quality related permits that may be required for the project.	Thank you for the information. The applicant has obtained the required storm water construction permits.

ID #		Comment	Response
42	2	Asks for NEPA analysis on possible effects to surface water quality from practices in riparian areas. That attention be given to water handling and disposal methods and efforts to prevent erosion.	The Final EA and the NEPA analysis on potential impacts to surface water are public documents. The BLM has determined that there will not be any surface or subsurface water discharges for this project. A closed loop fluid management system will be required and all fluids will be taken offsite to a qualified waste handler. The applicant is committed to follow the requirements of the stormwater construction general permit, and BLM stormwater management requirements.
43	1	Asks that the BLM adhere to their agency responsibility and be accountable for protection commitments they made on behalf of the public's natural resource.	We agree that the RMP has some fairly strong resource protection language for the two management units that include the proposed project area. The BLM is committed to following the requirements of the RMP and other relevant requirements, such as the Gold Book, for this project.
43	2	Urges the BLM to conduct a full environmental impact statement for the proposed project because of the potential for full-filed development without further NEPA review, as well as the areas unique resources as identified in the RMP.	The BLM has determined that for this two well project, an EA is the appropriate NEPA process. If potential for significant impacts are found in the EA, an EIS will be undertaken. There is no further development planned until results of exploratory wells evaluated, if further large scale gas field development is proposed an EIS would be conducted.
43	3	Impacts to big game populations, loss of license revenue, and loss of recreational opportunities to the many hunters from this premiere hunting area some of the considerations that need to be evaluated. Potential for this project to begin full-field development cannot be underestimated or dismissed by the BLM.	The impacts to big game populations, hunting, and recreation opportunities from this project will be minimized to the extent possible. There is no further development planned until results of exploratory wells are evaluated. If large scale gas field development is proposed, an EIS would be conducted.
43	4	Small populations of CRCT are vulnerable to elimination from events such as fire or flood. Both of these events have occurred within the Greater Red Creek ACEC and the Sugarloaf Basin Management Area within the last 8 years.	Thank you for this relevant information, it has been considered in the evaluating potential cumulative impacts.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	5	The Currant Creek watershed supports several CRCT populations. RMP states that management actions will be in support of watershed stability and CRCT habitat management objectives. Area is also an avoidance area for rights-of-way and surface disturbing activities.	This project is not in Currant Creek watershed, however as per the RMP both proposed wells are to be in areas with a watershed protection management objectives and in right of way avoidance areas. Also the north well is in a CRCT habitat watershed. Construction activities that have the potential to contribute sediment to the surface waters will be required to meet area specific management objectives.
43	6	The highly erodible soils in the proposed well area creates concern due to potential for sedimentation loading, headcutting, contamination, and decline of a cutthroat trout fishery, air quality, heavy traffic, and declining stability of streamside vegetation community.	The highly erodible nature of the area soils has been taken into consideration when undertaking any surface disturbing activities in the area, and additional protection measures may be warranted. Also, please refer to Response 38.11.
43	7	Trout Creek suffered a significant setback when a storm event 3 or 4 years ago destroyed the headwaters of the creek, decimating the trout population. Trout in this stream are now in the low population numbers.	Thank you for information. It was considered in preparation of the EA.
43	8	Requests relocation of the existing well #16-4-14-105 (incorrectly identified on BLM map) due to its uncomfortably close proximity to Trout Creek and Gooseberry Creek and implement directional drilling options.	The north well is located approximately half a mile from Trout Creek, and is not located in an alluvial area. Given the distance and lack of near-surface hydrologic conductivity to the Creek, the risk of a hazardous material spill from reaching the stream is minimal. However, actions intended to keep spills from occurring and responding to spills will be in place.
43	9	Prepare full analysis and inventory of current riparian and stream habitat conditions	NEPA documents, especially an EA, are based on available data. The BLM has used existing available information about the riparian and stream conditions in preparation of the this EA.
43	10	Prepare a full baseline inventory of coldwater fish species within, upstream, and downstream of the proposed project area.	Research studies are not part of EA analysis. The Wyoming Game and Fish Department's Fish Inventory Database was used to help determine if game and non-game fish and/or suitable fish habitat were located in or near the project area.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	11	Develop threshold mitigation habitat condition standards that must be annually maintained to offer protection to aquatic species.	NEPA documents, especially an EA, are based on available data. Research studies are not part of an EA NEPA analysis. However the BLM has used the Proper Functioning Condition (PFC) and other methods to ascertain the health of surface water and riparian areas, and uses these results in taking management actions.
43	12	Develop a threshold mitigation matrix that addresses fisheries, aquatic habitat and streamside changes depicted through either annual monitoring activities or visual observations.	The suggested matrix is not within the scope of the EA process. The SPCC plan addresses emergency responses.
43	13	Develop a mitigation program that addresses actions, remediation, accountability and monitoring efforts that will be implemented upon an industrial disaster or a stormwater runoff event that negatively impairs the water, vegetation or stream habitat.	The proposed program is not within the scope of the EA process. The SPCC plan addresses emergency responses.
43	14	Analyze a cumulative impact scenario that includes additional oil and gas project potential within this area.	Cumulative impacts of future development have been analyzed. However, there are not currently any reasonably foreseeable plans for increased oil and gas development in the area.
43	15	The sustainability of the sensitive ecological environment that exists in the southwest corner of WY and the dependent groundwater relationships for many wildlife and fisheries will be impacted by the cumulative effects of oil and gas development.	Refer to response 43.14
43	16	Impacts to ground and related surface water from potential full field development should be studied and mitigation measures described.	Refer to response 43.14
43	17	To properly evaluate potential landscape scale impacts, BLM must provide detailed description of subsurface hydrology of the project area with characterization of aquifers affected by proposed activities.	NEPA documents, especially an EA, are based on available data. The BLM has used available information about the subsurface hydrology and known aquifers to describe and analyze potential impacts for this EA.
43	18	The Greater Red Creek ACEC is located within an aquifer recharge zone supporting trout fisheries and aquatic diversity. Any endeavor that involves surface and subsurface disturbing activities must be analyzed and considered inappropriate if the potential exists for contamination or deterioration of the groundwater features.	For the reasons listed, the BLM is requiring a closed loop fluid management system, with no onsite disposal of fluids for this project. In addition, analysis of potential impacts to water resources has been included in this EA.

ID #	Comment	Response
43 19	Streams in the project area are small in volume and thus extremely susceptible to ground water contamination and spills.	See response above.
43 20	A full discussion of the project's water needs on groundwater is significant and considerable attention should be paid to analysis of this topic.	The project water will be trucked in from the Rock Springs municipal supply, which comes from the Green River, and its use should not impact local ground water resources. However, any potential impacts have been addressed in the EA.
43 21	Produced water quality is a major concern. Analysis should include a discussion of alternative methods of disposing of produced water. If evaporation ponds are recommended, impacts of potential leakage of produced water on the shallow groundwater resources should be considered.	This project involves only the drilling, completing and testing operations, so no produced water will be generated. In addition the BLM is requiring a closed loop fluid management system, with no onsite disposal of fluids.
43 22	Provide a detailed description of the subsurface hydrology of the project area, with characterization of the aquifers affected by the proposed activities.	A groundwater description and analysis of potential impacts is included as part of this EA.
43 23	Identify the differing geological formations and provide quantitative descriptions of the geohydrological characteristics of each formation	Based on the available information, a brief description of the area geologic formations and their hydrologic characteristics has been included in this EA.
43 24	Identify water users who depend upon groundwater resources impacted by the project and provide mitigation measures.	Groundwater users will be indentified by searching the Wyoming State Engineers groundwater well database.
43 25	Provide a thorough analysis of surface and subsurface hydrologic conditions and produced water with a full discussion of produced water disposal, including treatment, re-injection, evaporation and discharge.	Please see responses 43.20 through 43.23.
43 26	Analyze the impact of well development activities, including frac'ing, the use of drilling muds and injection of other substances, penetration of aquifers and aquitards and related potential inter-aquifer communication.	Drilling practices are described in the APD's, and are covered by Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 2. These describe well development activities, including how the well casing is set to avoid inter-aquifer communication.
43 27	Complete a thorough and updated baseline water quality study of streams and aquifers near the planned well locations.	NEPA documents, especially EAs, are based on available data, and research studies not part of EA NEPA analysis. A thorough review of the available water quality data has been conducted and incorporated into this EA.
43 28	Establish a well monitoring protocol near each oil or gas well pad for spill detection.	Visual monitoring and facility inspections are required per the SPCC plan.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	29	Conduct a thorough and updated analysis on all stream and drainage crossings of pipelines, roads, improved access areas, staging areas, and water disposal facilities.	In order to minimize impacts from this project, there are no stream or drainage crossings. Existing County and State roads will be accessed, but no improvements will be required on these roads.
43	30	Define specific mitigation measures that the BLM will use to limit and prevent impacts to the hydrological systems within the numerous watersheds.	Specific hydrologic mitigation measures has been included in the EA.
43	31	Provide a full discussion of potential contamination issues.	The EA and associated documents, such as the SPCC Plan, include a review of potential contamination issues. This includes a list of hazardous materials, handling practices, and spill control practices.
43	32	Provide a full review of the amount of infrastructure required to handle any water treatment issues, hold, transport or management, with respect to the unique sensitive nature of this environment.	Please refer to responses 43.20 through 43.23.
43	33	Evaluation of the impact of constructing gas collection pipelines between the project site and refinery facilities with respect to issues of erosion and sedimentation on nearby watercourses.	Please refer to response 2.4
43	34	Discussion of the water demand associated with the exploratory drilling and production activities and the source of water anticipated to supply the demand, with analysis of the impact on affected water users.	Please refer to response 43.20. Anticipated water needs have been discussed in the EA.
43	35	Provide a full analysis for integrating this proposed project into the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative.	Please refer to response 43.73
43	36	Coldwater species such as trout are particularly vulnerable to climate change. Native trout species are already pushed to the edge of extinction. It is important that they be protected in the headwater areas of this project.	Please refer to response 43.38. Mitigation measures necessary to protect the CRCT habitat are required and will be fully implemented as part of this project.
43	37	BLM should be prepared to discuss the impacts of carbon emissions from the development of the project.	This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planned. The drilling operations will result in carbon dioxide emissions which are discussed in the air sections of this EA.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	38	The commenter requests that the latest innovative technologies be utilized to determine how the two wells will contribute to climate change impacts to trout streams that are important spawning and rearing areas.	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Fourth Assessment Synthesis states: 'Global Greenhouse Gas emissions due to human activities have grown since pre-industrial times, with an increase in 70% between 1970 and 2004. Global atmospheric concentrations of CO_2, methane, and nitrous oxides have increased markedly as a result of human activities since 1750, and now far exceed pre-industrial values determined from ice cores spanning many thousands of years. However, past and current models regarding climate change and its subsequent impacts have primarily been developed at global to continental scales. Thus, the impact from the two proposed wells to climate change would be impossible to quantify.
43	39	With respect to climate change, evaluate the potential for removal or elimination f any stream barrier within the project boundaries that may impact instream flows.	Refer to response 43.38
43	40	With respect to climate change, develop a science-based protection plan of streamside habitats that may be impacted	Refer to response 43.38
43	41	With respect to climate change, identify the most important reaches of these streams which contain populations of cutthroat and develop protection measures.	Refer to response 43.38
43	42	With respect to climate change, provide an annual monitoring program that establishes goals and objectives for improving stream habitat and minimizes contamination from drilling and production.	Refer to response 43.38
43	43	With respect to climate change, develop vegetation management programs that account for drought impacts and habitat loss to big game, sensitive species, and other wildlife dependent of specific vegetative components unique to this area.	Refer to response 43.38
43	44	With respect to climate change, implement conservation strategies for water management by Devon that helps minimize water decreases during low water periods.	Refer to response 43.38

ID #		Comment	Response
43	45	With respect to climate change, provide an estimate of the amount of carbon dioxide and methane emissions that will be generated by this project and identify means for reducing them.	This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planned. If large scale gas field development is proposed, an EIS would be conducted. This EA makes an estimate of the emissions during drilling and testing procedures for the two exploratory wells.
43	46	Wildlife watching and hunting are valuable economic components for this state and in particular the southwestern portion of Wyoming.	Thank you for comment.
43	47	BLM must provide management actions that assist toward reducing greater sage grouse and pigmy rabbit from the sensitive species list. Approving the surface disturbing activities associated with oil and gas development in this area does not place the BLM in a position of meeting its obligation toward those management objectives.	Thank you for comment. The BLM is committed to following all the relevant requirements in protecting sensitive species. See the Special Status Management section and Appendices 10-1 and 10-2 of the RMP for a more information.
43	48	BLM must take a hard look at how the proposed action could adversely affect aquifer recharge, groundwater quality, riparian health, watershed condition, and the ability of the public to enjoy dispersed recreation throughout the area.	The EA evaluated the potential impacts from this two exploratory well proposed project on the resources listed.
43	50	Analyze the impacts on a landscape scale that could affect big game populations and agency management objectives.	Potential impacts from this project on big game species have been evaluated in this EA. The scale of the analysis was based on data that included the size of the home range of the big game herds. BLM management objectives are part of that evaluation.
43	51	Analyze the cumulative economic impacts associated with a decline in hunting permits to WGFD, local businesses and to the hunting public.	The EA evaluated potential socioeconomic impacts from this project. If a significant decline is not anticipated.
43	52	Analyze the impacts to big game migration corridors from habitat fragmentation, roads, energy infrastructure development, etc.	Refer to response 43.50
43	53	Development and implementation of a cooperative inventory plan.	Thank you for your comment; it is not clear what the commenter is requesting.
43	54	Identify threshold for wildlife populations and map out mitigation measures.	NEPA EA's are generally based on available data. According to the CEQ regulations, an EA is to "briefly provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an EIS or a FONSI". Collection of the additional data and plans requested is outside the scope of this project.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	55	Provide a thorough research inventory on the latest impacts to wildlife and fisheries from oil and gas development	Refer to response 43.54.
43	56	provide a cumulative effects scenario that illustrates what may occur to species (particularly sensitive or threatened species) that are impacted negatively from this project	Refer to response 43.54.
43	57	Identify significant migration corridors for all wildlife species with modeling of scenarios that may occur should migration corridors be fragmented or lost	Migration corridors are identified in the EA. Refer to response 43.54.
43	58	Address the implications to wildlife that depend on winter habitat in this region and the impacts anticipated from oil and gas development and infrastructure intrusion, including year round access	The EA has addressed the issues related to wildlife and crucial winter range from this two well proposal. Analysis of full field development is not part of this EA.
43	59	Present an environmental compliance plan for enforcement of environmental compliance, monitoring and remediation to wildlife.	Refer to response 43.58
43	60	Present and analysis of the development plan and the seasonal timing restrictions as they apply to all wildlife species.	Refer to response 43.58
43	61	Develop a mitigation plan that includes the proponent's ability to fund wildlife studies and contribute to a wildlife mitigation fund	Refer to response 43.58
43	62	Develop and analysis that addresses the oil and gas expansion into adjacent BLM areas and the impacts that wildlife species might expect from a significant loss of source or crucial habitat.	Refer to response 43.54 and 43.58
43	63	Evaluate the impacts that might occur when oil and gas act activities push large populations of wildlife into other and often smaller or lesser quality habitats merely by the presence of an industry's activities.	Refer to response 43.54 and 43.58
43	64	Evaluate habitat competition among various wildlife species when habitat loss and fragmentation occurs.	Refer to response 43.54 and 43.58

ID #		Comment	Response
43	65	Evaluate the cumulative and simultaneous noise impacts from project operations that will impact herds of migrating or birthing wildlife as they move from one source of important habitat in the spring to another source in the fall (or vice versa).	The impacts of the proposed activity on wildlife and the elk parturition areas have been evaluated. The potential impacts of noise on migrating or birthing wildlife herds are expected to be temporary. This project covers exploration only, so once the wells have been completed, they will be plugged, abandoned, and reclaimed, or shut in.
43	66	Analysis of the worst-case scenario should wildlife species be forced out of important birthing habitats and implications for the wildlife populations and associated secondary impacts.	This proposed project is not located in any BLM identified wildlife parturition areas. Also the TLS for the south well crucial winter range is required.
43	67	Cumulative analysis of loss of migration corridors, winter habitat and summer habitat to big game species, fisheries, sensitive species, and any T&E species.	A cumulative impact analysis on wildlife has been carried out as part of this EA. There are no known T&E species in the proposal area. However, the EA has evaluated the potential presence of any T&E species.
43	68	Requests that BLM include a detailed analysis of the environmental and economic impacts should these wells turn out to be CBM wells	Natural gas is anticipated at the target well depths for this project. No CBM is expected, and is therefore outside the scope of this EA.
43	69	Concerned about the amount of water that is produced in conjunction with CBM development and the impacts to nearby aquifers. Including impacts from fracing activities.	Refer to response 43.68.
43	70	The compressors required for CBM gas release a number of emissions into the air and incomplete combustion of the natural gas used to fire them can release formaldehyde into the air.	Refer to response 43.68.
43	71	Requests that BLM look at CBM-related impacts that could occur should Devon's proposed exploratory wells produce CBM.	Refer to response 43.68.
43	72	Requests an updated status of the management actions outlined in the RMP regarding withdrawal of leases in the area.	The 1997 RMP is the conforming document for this project. The mineral leases covered under this project cannot be withdrawn after lease issuance, absent an act of Congress. The requested information can be sought from the BLM, but is not within the scope of this project.

ID #		Comment	Response
43	73	Requests that this project and the entire Greater Red Creek ACEC be fully evaluated at a landscape scale under the Wyoming Landscape Conservation Initiative and recommendations in the Western Governors Association's (WGA) Oil and Gas Working Group report, in the event that the BLM proceed with approval on this development	Thank you for identifying these relevant documents. The documents listed have been reviewed as part of the EA analysis, but a landscape scale evaluation of the entire Greater Red Creek ACEC is not within the scope of this EA.
43	74	Supports the WGFD's recommendation to consider the repurchase of the leases and to withdraw the area from future leasing. If withdrawal cannot be pursued, TU requests that the agency prepare an environmental impact statement which includes numerous conservation alternatives.	The repurchase or withdrawal of leases in the area are not within the scope of this EA, but can be pursued with BLM outside of the EA process. The BLM has determined that ,for this two well project, an EA is the appropriate NEPA process.
44	1	Describes limitations that can be placed on an existing federal oil and gas leases, but states that the project cannot be prohibited.	Required mitigation measures cover reasonable actions necessary to minimize adverse impacts, and are in accordance with the RMP and other applicable regulations.
44	2	States that Devon is committed to exploring for domestic energy sources while protecting natural resources and the environment.	The BLM works under a mandate of management of public lands that provides for multiple-use, while providing for protection of natural resources for future generations. Under this mandate, the BLM is committed to working with mineral lease holders on responsible energy development.
44	3	Provides background on rationale for natural gas production, and states that this project is crucial to the local economy and has environmental benefits over other forms of energy production.	Thank you for your comment and concern.
44	4	Supports and encourages the BLM to prepare an EA for this project as soon as possible.	An EA has been prepared.
45	1	All alternatives and their prospective project components must be analyzed for near-field and far-field impacts, and should include criteria pollutants and Air Quality Related Values.	This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planned. If large scale gas field development is proposed, an EIS would be conducted and those impacts analyzed.
45	2	Alternatives or portions of alternatives that are not fully analyzed for air quality cannot be selected and incorporated into the ROD for this project.	There are two alternatives for this EA. Both alternatives have been evaluated as part of this NEPA process.
45	3	Directional drilling, multiple wells on a single pad, and well clustering warrants special consideration for air quality impacts.	The two exploratory wells proposed in this EA are miles apart making directional drilling impossible. Also exploratory wells are generally drilled vertically in order to ensure accurate well log information.

ID #		Comment	Response
45	4	Prior to air dispersion modeling a complete up-to-date emission inventory is needed. It is important to no exclude any project emissions sources.	Based on the relatively limited scope of this two-well EA, no air modeling was conducted.
45	5	A new lower ozone standard may be in place by March 2008, so modeled ozone impacts based on the existing standard will need to be compared to the new standards	Please refer to Response 45.4
45	6	States that it is imperative that a cooperative relationship between the Air Quality Division, BLM, and its contractors be developed in order to ensure complete and accurate air quality assessment.	The BLM agrees and contacted personnel from the Air Quality Division to ensure the most up-to date and accurate information was available in preparation of this EA.
45	7	Maintains that no air quality modeling should occur until an air quality assessment protocol has been approved by the Air Quality Stakeholders Group, and an air quality inventory has been reviewed by the Air Quality Division.	Please refer to Response 45.4
45	8	Encourages the establishment of meteorological and ambient monitoring stations prior to commencement of project activities. For use with future EIS alternatives development.	NEPA documents, especially EAs, are based on available data. Additional data collection studies are not planned for this NEPA analysis. However, establishment of air monitoring stations can be sought with the BLM.
46	1	Protests any drilling in the Little Mountain area; is concerned that drilling will occur on every inch of the territory; and wants to keep some area just as they are.	Thank you for your comment.
47	1	Recreation and wildlife are important commodities among American citizens and the Little Mountain area in Sweetwater County, Wyoming is a place that hosts such significance and value. This rugged Wyoming landscape supports abundant wildlife populations , sensitive species, as well as ample recreation opportunities	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 43.3.
47	2	The Little Mountain area, which includes the Greater Red Creek ACEC and Sugarloaf Basin Management Area, is the most popular elk hunting spot in the state, along with being an outstanding outdoor and backcountry recreation area. This project will create damage to our recreation, wildlife, habitats, fisheries, soils, groundwater, surface water, and air quality.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 43.3.

ID #		Comment	Response
47	3	The quality recreation, healthy big game, sage grouse populations, and aquatic species, such as the imperiled CRCT will see negative consequences from this development in the immediate and surrounding area.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 43.3.
47	4	The Sugarloaf Basin Management Area is to be managed under the objective of enhancing or improving the landscape as well as to "maintain important wildlife habitat" (Green River RMP, 1997, page 40). These management objectives will not be met if the proposed project is approved.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to response 43.3.
47	5	In the event that the BLM does approve this project, respectfully request a full environmental impact statement because of the enormity of this project and the likelihood that this will become a full-field development.	This project involves only the drilling, completing and testing operations of two wells. Refer to response 43.2.
47	6	The proposed wells and associated construction, pipelines, as well as noise, water and air degradation will independently and cumulatively impact this wide range of species.	This project involves only the drilling, completing and testing operations of two wells. Refer to response 43.2.
47	7	Hunting in this area means that the surrounding communities and the WGFD benefit from their business. This business will be reduced if development is allowed because families and hunters do not come to this area to see energy development nor will they spend their money. Hunters, anglers and trappers expended approximately $350 million in pursuit of their sport in 2005.	This project involves only the drilling, completing and testing operations of two wells. There is no further development planned until results of exploratory wells evaluated. If further large scale gas field development is proposed, an EIS would be conducted and potential large scale impacts to hunting and recreation will be evaluated.
47	8	A poll conducted in 2006 showed that 55% of the public valued their hunting and fishing activities away from motorized vehicles and roads. Another in 2007 showed that 86% were in favor of banning development on certain public lands that are unique and have special fish and wildlife management resources that offer different/unique hunting/fishing opportunities.	Thank you for your comment.

ID #		Comment	Response
47	9	A thriving elk herd resides in this project area and is the most sought after elk tags in the state. Natural gas well mean the potential for new roads, which would increase hunter access, reduce cover security for the elk, increase elk vulnerability, and decrease trophy sized elk.	The impacts of the proposed activity on hunting opportunities have been evaluated in the EA. The access roads will be removed and the area reclaimed at the end of the project.
47	10	Adequate and suitable habitat for the sage grouse should be protected to not cause a further decline in the species population numbers.	Please refer to response 5.11
47	11	Increased human activity is also a concern due to the potential for animals to be harmed through harassment, poaching, or negligent driving.	Please refer to responses 2.3 and 10.1.
47	12	BLM should consider the importance of the CRCT. This species is labeled as a stream species of greatest conservation need in WY by the WGFD.	Please refer to responses 10.1 and 11.1.
47	13	Establish threshold for wildlife and fisheries impacts that would include indicators, a policy to mitigate or curb the impacts, and prevention methods to maintain wildlife and fish numbers.	Please refer to response 43.54.
47	14	Provide current inventory studies and a full analysis (prior the proposed project approval) of wildlife habitat, wildlife species, current riparian and stream habitat conditions for fisheries that depend on the project area. In addition, a complete inventory of coldwater fish species upstream and downstream of the project area is needed.	Please refer to response 43.54.
47	15	Develop action plans for monitoring, addressing threshold and mitigation	Please refer to response 43.54.
47	16	Provide the most current impact data to wildlife and fisheries from mineral extraction development and production.	Please refer to responses 10.1, 11.1 and 43.54
47	17	Identify migration corridors for all wildlife species within the project area and on a landscape scale that considers migration corridor changes due the development. Also, provide and action plan for if or when migration corridors are fragmented or lost.	Please refer to responses 10.1, 11.1 and 43.54
47	18	Provide an environment compliance plan that looks at the BLM and how they will enforce monitoring, environmental compliance and remediation on wildlife and fisheries that will be affected by oil and gas development in the project area.	Please refer to response 43.54.

ID #		Comment	Response
47	19	Supply a comprehensive analysis of the seasonal timing restrictions and the development plan as applied to all wildlife species.	Please refer to response 43.54.
47	20	Establish a mitigation plan with a threshold matrix that addresses wildlife, wildlife habitat, fisheries, aquatic habitat and stream changes.	Please refer to response 43.54
47	21	Develop a landscape scale cumulative impacts analysis that addresses the oil and gas development within and outside of the proposed project area. Include how that impacts crucial habitat, and crucial ranges (such as winter, summer and transitional) for wildlife species, including ungulate populations as a whole. This will entail the issue of species being pushed onto less suitable habitat.	Please refer to responses 11.1 and 43.54
47	22	Evaluate the competition for habitat that will occur among wildlife species when they are forced onto small tracts of land with fragmentation	Please refer to responses 11.1 and 43.54
47	24	Air quality is part of the experience of an undisturbed landscape that visitors come to the Little Mountain area for.	Thank you for your comment.
47	25	BLM needs to conduct a comprehensive air quality model and analysis. A landscape scale approach should encompass the surrounding area. This work should be accomplished using the most current scientific methodology under state and federal assessment protocol.	Please refer to response 45.4.
47	26	Ambient air monitoring programs should be utilized with the goal of exceeding the stated mitigation goals. An analysis should be provided with particular focus on visibility, regional haze, acid deposition, and potential increases in acidification to acid sensitive lakes.	Please refer to responses 45.8.
47	27	If the BLM finds that comprehensive and current air quality data is lacking while the next stage of this proposed plan is being established, the plans should be placed on hold until such data is complete.	This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planned.
47	28	The proposed development plan should include emission pollutants that will occur with every level of field development and production.	Please refer to responses 47.27.

ID #		Comment	Response
47	29	Cumulative air quality impacts from Devon's proposal should be analyzed in combination with major cities in Utah and other southwestern states, the current and expanded development in the Wamsutter area and Red Desert area.	This EA is for two exploratory wells, with no production planned. If large scale gas field development is proposed, an EIS would be conducted.
47	30	BLM should identify all air quality impacts and mitigation criteria from the onset for the project area, even if they are unable to (under jurisdiction) to implement them. All preventions and remedies that the BLM can implement should be identified. Performance goals and objectives can be established to improve the quality of air and to reduce cumulative impacts.	Please refer to responses 10.1 and 43.54
47	31	Require the operator to use the latest technology for non-polluting generators.	Drilling operation impacts will be minimized, and the requirements under the Onshore Oil and Gas Orders 1 and 2 will be followed.
47	32	Cumulative affects from habitat fragmentation and degradation, possible road construction, increased traffic, vegetation removal will raise sediment levels in streams.	The potential for sediment production will be minimized through required mitigation measures. The cumulative effects of this project along with other potential impacts to surface water quality have been evaluated in this EA.
47	33	The proposed natural gas wells may have an impact on local and regional groundwater and surface water resources.	Refer to responses 47.32 and 47.31.
47	34	The BLM must not underestimate the amount of water that this natural gas production will require. Expresses concerns about water resource impacts	Please refer to response 43.20 and 43.21.
47	35	Provide a complete description of the subsurface hydrology with information on how the aquifers will be affected by the proposed activities.	Please refer to responses 43.23 and 43.26.
47	36	Produced water and disposal issues need to be analyzed and identified prior to project approval.	Please refer to response 43.21.
47	37	Conduct a full range of alternative actions for disposing of produced water.	Please refer to responses 41.10 and 42.2.
47	38	Identify groundwater users that could be impacted by the proposed project. Also identify mitigation measures	Please refer to responses 43.24. Mitigation measures to avoid contaminating groundwater are included in the EA.
47	39	Baseline water studies need to be conducted prior to authorization of this project in order to avoid denial of responsibility by operators if impacts are found later.	Please refer to responses 10.1 and 43.54

ID #		Comment	Response
47	40	Provide an analysis related to fracing and how that will impact surface and groundwater.	Please refer to responses 43.54.
47	41	Implement a monitoring system for detecting spills around natural gas pads.	Please refer to responses 43.54.
47	42	Conduct a comprehensive analysis on waterways near or crossing pipelines, roads, water disposal facilities, and staging areas.	Please refer to responses 43.54.
47	43	A complete assessment of the impacts should be conducted on ground and surface waters related to the proposed project.	NEPA documents, especially EAs, are based on available data, and research studies are not part of the EA NEPA analysis. A review of the available surface and ground water data has been evaluated and incorporated into this EA.
47	44	Given the potential for significant impacts, requests that this proposed project have a full consideration of the no development alternative.	A no development alternative has been considered as part of this EA
47	45	Strongly urge the BLM to conduct an EIS on this proposed project that includes a range of alternatives.	Please refer to responses 10.1.
48	1	States that BLM's decision should comply with the Wyoming Standards and Guidelines for Healthy Rangelands and the requirements under the Green River RMP.	This project complies with relevant portions of the standards and guidelines for Healthy Rangelands, and with the Green River RMP.
48	2	Conditions of approval should be required to ensure that the values that the Sugarloaf Basin Special Management Area was established for are not significantly degraded.	Conditions of approval for this project have been established that ensure the project is consistent with the management objectives of Sugarloaf Basin SMA.
48	3	The EA should include maps showing aquifer recharge zones and their relationship to surface disturbing activities. Well locations should not be sited over an aquifer recharge area.	A map showing aquifer recharge areas and the well locations is included in the EA. However, the RMP allows for mineral development in the aquifer recharge area provided that groundwater recharge is maintained in a healthy and functioning condition. Protection efforts include limiting road density, surface disturbing activities, and surface occupancy in identified recharge zones.
48	4	The BLM should undertake a thorough analysis of impacts to groundwater deletions, groundwater flow modeling, and implications to hyporheic flows to surface waters.	Please refer to response 43.54

ID #		Comment	Response
48	5	Water quality and quantity issues should be addressed, contamination risks quantified, and impacts of this project, together with other projects, should be addressed.	Refer to response 47.43
48	6	If Devon has provided the BLM with data about the potential of full field development, then this information should be considered as a reasonably foreseeable action under the cumulative impacts section.	Please refer to responses 10.1.
48	7	The BLM should require Conditions of Approval that prevent unnecessary degradation pursuant to FLPMA, and implement directives for management areas as established under the RMP.	The EA includes Conditions of Approval that prevent unnecessary degradation pursuant to FLPMA, and ensures that special management areas are managed in accordance with the RMP requirements.
48	8	Requests that the BLM allow public comment on the forthcoming EA prior to issuance of a Decision Record or EIS.	Please refer to responses 5.1.
48	9	Requests that the BLM consider other alternatives that focus on lowest-impact techniques, such as moving well pads outside of environmentally sensitive landscapes.	Prior to the starting the EA, Devon and the BLM RSFO examined the location of the well pads and roads with regard to potential impacts. Based on these pre-proposal analyses, both well pads were moved to reduce impacts to trails, surface waters, wildlife, and vegetation
48	10	Impacts to historic, cultural and Native American sacred resources should be studied. Including cultural surveys, SHPO consultation, etc.	A cultural survey for both sites has been completed, including consultation with SHPO.
48	11	Impacts related to pipeline right-of way placement should be analyzed.	Please refer to responses 10.1.
48	12	Areas of potential surface disturbance should be cleared by a trained paleontologist prior to project commencement.	A trained paleontologist evaluate the project location as part of the EA process.
48	13	Baseline information on population size, trends, habitat quality for big game, BLM Sensitive Species, and CRCT should be disclosed by alternative.	Available information on population size, trends, habitat quality for big game, BLM Sensitive Species, and CRCT were discussed, by alternative, in the EA.
48	14	To what degree will natural salinity in soils directly or cumulatively impact the salinity of local waterways and Colorado River and tributaries?	Please refer to response 43.54
48	15	What are the limits to which the project will be visible and audible? Carry out a GIS analysis to define the project viewshed.	The project complies with the VRM requirements for the area. A viewshed impact assessment was carried as part of this EA.

ID #		Comment	Response
48	16	It is preferable that the area remain undeveloped until other existing full field developments can be reclaimed.	The cumulative impact assessment evaluated the combined impacts of this and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities to determine if this project will significantly add to cumulative impacts of other activities.
49	1	A full EIS is warranted in this case for many reasons, including habitat disturbance, cherished recreation lands, adjacent to special management areas, visibility impairment, and others.	Please refer to responses 10.1.
49	2	States that the BLM told him that they cannot consider cumulative impacts for this project. Refers to CEQ regulation on cumulative impact analysis. Asks for assurance that the BLM will carry out cumulative impacts analysis	Please refer to responses 48.16
49	3	Asks what is the significance in the scoping notice map of both wells having the same number?	That was a mistake and has been corrected.
49	4	Asks for a full EIS to be written on this project.	Please refer to responses 10.1.

APPENDIX D

LEASE STIPULATIONS

BLM Lease Stipulations

Well # 16-5-14-105,
(North well - Located in the Sage Creek portion of the Greater Red Creek Area of Critical Environmental Concern)

1. Controlled Surface Use (CSU) (1) Surface occupancy or use within ¼ mile or visual horizon of trail whichever is closer may be restricted or prohibited unless the operator and surface managing agency arrive at an acceptable plan for mitigation of anticipated impacts; (2) as mapped on the Rock Springs Field Office GIS database; (3) protecting cultural and scenic values of the Cherokee trail.

2. CSU (1) Surface occupancy or use within the Sage Creek Management Area will be restricted or prohibited unless the operator and surface managing agency arrive at an acceptable plan for mitigation of anticipated impacts; (2) entire lease (3) protecting wildlife, recreation, and watershed resources.

Well # 16 -28-13-106
(South well - Located in the Sugarloaf Basin Special Management Area)

1. Special lease stipulation: This lease may be found to contain historic properties and/or resources protected under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, E.O. 13007, or other statutes and Executive Orders. The BLM will not approve any ground disturbing activities that may affect any such properties or resources until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the NHPA and others authorities. The BLM may require modification to exploration or development proposals to protect such properties, or disapprove any activity that is likely to result in adverse effects that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized or mitigated.

2. Timing Limitation Stipulation (TLS) (1) Nov 15 to Apr 30; (2) as mapped on the Rock Springs Field Office GIS database; (3) protecting big game on crucial winter range.

3. CSU (1) Surface occupancy or use within the Sugarloaf Basin area will be restricted or prohibited unless the operator and surface managing agency arrive at an acceptable plan for mitigation of anticipated impacts; (2) as mapped on the Rock Springs Field Office GIS database; (3) protecting steep slopes, visual resources, recreation, watershed, cultural, and wildlife values.

4. CSU (1) the lease area may now or hereafter contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid BLM-approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such species or their habitat. BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligations under applicable

requirements of the Endangered Species Act as amended, 16 U.S.C. §1531 et seq., including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation; (2) as mapped by Rock Springs Field Office GIS database; (3) protecting *Amphispiza billineata* (sage sparrow); *Cirsium ownbeyi* (owenbey's thistle); *Brachylagus idahoensis* (pygmy rabbit); *Lanius ludovicianus* (loggerhead shrike); *Oreoscoptes montanus* (sage thrusher); *Spiranthes diluvialis* (Ute ladies'-tresses); *Vulpes velox* (swift fox).

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E —GREEN RIVER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN OBJECTIVES AND ACTIONS APPLICABLE TO THE BAXTER EA

Resource	Objectives and Actions
AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT	AIR-4–Surface disturbing activities will be managed to prevent violation of air quality regulations. Construction and surface disturbing activities will be designed with dust control measures to reduce general air quality impacts and visibility impacts.
CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL MANAGEMENT	CULT-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To expand the opportunities for scientific study, and educational and interpretive uses of cultural and paleontological resources; (2) To protect and preserve important cultural and paleontological resources and/or their historic record for future generations.
Congressionally Designated Historic Trails	CULT-4–The area within one-quarter mile or the visual horizon (whichever is less) of any contributing trail segment will be an avoidance area for surface disturbing activities.
Human Burial Locations	CULT-13–Exchanges for acquisition and cooperative agreements will be pursued to enhance management of cultural resources.
Paleontological Resources	CULT-14–Significant paleontological resources will be managed for their scientific and educational values and in accordance with 43 CFR 3600, 43 CFR 3622, and 43 CFR 8365.
FIRE MANAGEMENT	FIRE-3–Fire suppression actions will be based on achieving the most efficient control and allowing historical acres burned to increase. Activity plans will be developed for designated fire management areas defining specific parameters for all fire occurrences.
	FIRE-9–A site-specific analysis will be prepared for sensitive areas such as special status plant species, cultural sites, historic trails, and areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC) to determine the appropriate suppression activity that will be acceptable.
HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MANAGEMENT	HAZ-2–MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: For BLM-authorized activities that involve hazardous materials or their use, precautionary measures will be used to guard against releases or spills into the environment. If safety hazards are identified as a result of hazardous waste spills on BLM-administered public lands, BLM would provide appropriate warnings to the public.
LIVESTOCK GRAZING MANAGEMENT	LVSTK-2–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE: (2) To maintain, improve, or restore riparian habitat to enhance forage conditions, wildlife habitat, and stream quality; and
	LVSTK-19–All constructed fences will follow construction standards and design (BLM Manual 1740) and will be located and designed to not impede wild horse movement.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
	LVSTK-21–Noxious weed infestations will be controlled through livestock management or by environmentally acceptable mechanical, chemical, or biological means. BLM will cooperate and coordinate with county weed and pest districts.
MINERALS MANAGEMENT Leasable Minerals	MINS-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The objective for management of BLM-administered federal minerals is to maintain or enhance opportunities for mineral exploration and development while protecting other resource values. The objective for management of oil and gas resources is to provide for leasing, exploration, and development of oil and gas while protecting other values.
	MINS-2–Public lands within the checkerboard area are open to mineral leasing and development (to promote mineral resource recovery), with appropriate mitigation measures to be applied on a case-by-case basis.
	MINS-3–WSAs are closed to leasing in accordance with wilderness interim management requirements. This closure is not subject to a land use planning decision (nondiscretionary closure).
	MINS-4–MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: BLM-administered public lands not specifically closed are open to consideration of oil and gas leasing. The remainder of the public lands in the planning area are open to consideration for oil and gas leasing with appropriate mitigation measures. Table 7 provides information on which restrictions apply to particular actions and land uses to protect resource values in certain areas. This table provides guidelines for all surface disturbing activities, not just those related to oil and gas exploration and development activities.
	MINS-5–Where maximum protection of resources is necessary, a No Surface Occupancy requirement will be imposed. Additional areas may be identified through site-specific environmental analysis and activity planning.
MINERALS MANAGEMENT Oil and Gas	MINS-6–Timing limitations (seasonal restrictions) will be applied when activities occur during crucial periods or would adversely affect crucial or sensitive resources. Such resources include, but are not limited to, soils during wet and muddy periods, crucial wildlife seasonal use areas, and raptor nesting areas. Exceptions to seasonal restrictions may be granted.
	MINS-7–Where controlled use or restrictions on specific activities are needed but do not necessarily exclude activities, controlled surface use or surface disturbance restrictions will be designed to protect those resources. These restrictions will be placed on areas where resources could be avoided or adverse effects could be mitigated.
	MINS-8–Development actions will be analyzed on a case-by-case basis to identify mitigation needs to meet RMP objectives, to provide for resource protection, and to provide for logical development. Limitations on the amount, sequence, timing, or level of development may occur. This may result in transportation planning and in limitations in the number of roads and drill pads, or in deferring development in some areas until other areas have been restored to previous uses.
OHV MANAGEMENT	OHV-4–Vehicular travel in crucial and important wildlife habitats (strutting grounds, spawning beds, big game ranges, etc.) and during crucial and important periods (such as calving/fawning periods) will be restricted seasonally as necessary.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
RECREATION RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	xxxREC-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities sought by the public while protecting other resources, (2) To meet legal requirements for the health and safety of visitors, and (3) To mitigate conflicts between recreation and other types of resource uses. Information provided by the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum will aid in identifying the types of recreation uses occurring on public lands. REC-14–Surface disturbing activities are prohibited within a quarter-mile of recreation sites, unless such activities are determined to be com3atible with or are performed for meeting recreation objectives for the area. Generally, such activities (e.g., those associated with mineral development, roads, pipelines, powerlines, etc.) will be designed to avoid these areas. These areas would be open to development of recreation site facilities. An approved plan will be required prior to the site disturbance. REC-17–Posting information and directional signs will be necessary in some areas. The Green River RMP establishes various types of resource designations, and sign posting will be provided to promote visitor use of the various areas consistent with management objectives.
SPECIAL STATUS PLANT SPECIES MANAGEMENT	SSP-2–MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Any management actions on potential habitat of special status plant species communities on federal land or on split-estate lands (i.e., nonfederal land surface ownership with BLM-administered federal minerals ownership) will require searches for the plant species prior to project or activity implementation to determine the locations of special status plant species and essential and/or important habitats. Special status plant populations are closed to activities that could adversely affect these species and their habitat. Management requirements in habitat areas may include prohibiting or limiting motorized vehicle use, surface uses, and explosive charges or any other surface disturbing or disruptive activity that may cause adverse effects to the plants. SSP-3–Known locations of special status plant species communities will be protected and closed to the following activities: 1. Surface disturbing activities or any disruptive activity that could adversely affect the plants or their habitat 2. Location of new mining claims (withdrawal from mineral location and entry under the land laws will be pursued) 3. Mineral material sales 4. All OHV use, including those vehicles used for geophysical exploration activities and surveying 5. The use of explosives and blasting. SSP-4–Locations of special status plant species are open to consideration for mineral leasing with a No Surface Occupancy requirement. SSP-8–Management prescriptions for threatened and endangered species and proposed threatened and endangered species will be developed on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	VEG-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To maintain or enhance vegetation community health, composition, and diversity to meet watershed, wild horse, wildlife, and livestock grazing resource management objectives; and (2) To provide for plant diversity (desired plant communities). VEG-3–The minimum management goal for riparian areas is to achieve proper functioning condition. This is considered the first priority for vegetation management. Desired plant communities must meet the criteria for proper functioning condition. VEG-16–Vegetation buffer strips would be provided along streams to control sedimentation. Generally vegetation buffer strips 100 feet wide would be left intact adjacent to perennial streams. VEG-19–Riparian Vegetation Management Actions: Riparian habitat in proper functioning condition is the minimum acceptable status or level within the Green River Resource Area. Under this RMP, 75 percent of the riparian areas should, within 10 years, have activity and implementation plans in various states of implementation that will allow riparian areas to achieve or maintain proper functioning condition. VEG-20–Site-specific activity and implementation plans will be used to identify methods to achieve or maintain proper functioning condition in riparian areas. VEG-21–Methods applied where grazing occurs include, but are not limited to, fencing, establishment of pastures and exclosures, off-site water development, off-site salt or mineral supplement placement, timing and seasons of use, establishment of allowable use levels for key riparian species, herding, and grazing systems. Methods applied where surface disturbing activities occur include, but are not limited to, distance restrictions, timing constraints, sediment containment and control design, and reclamation practices.
VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT	VRM-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To maintain or improve scenic values and visual quality; and (2) To establish priorities for managing the visual resources in conjunction with other resource values. VRM-2–MANAGEMENT ACTIONS: Visual resource classes will be retained or modified to enhance other resource objectives, such as those for cultural resource and recreation management, wild horse viewing, and special management areas. VRM-3–Projects and facilities will be designed to meet the objectives of the established visual classifications, and appropriate mitigation will be included. Facilities (either in place or new), including linear rights-of-way, must be screened, painted, or designed to blend with the surrounding landscape. VRM-4–All surface disturbing actions, regardless of the visual resource management class, are required to be mitigated to reduce visual impacts. This will be achieved by designing and locating the disturbances in a manner that most closely meets the minimum degree of contrast acceptable for the visual resource management class. VRM-5–Management actions on public lands with a Class II visual resource management classification must be designed to blend into and retain the existing character of the natural landscape.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
	VRM-6–Management actions on public lands with a Class III visual resource management classification must be designed to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.
	VRM-9–The scenic values along Highway 191, and County Roads 34 and 36 within Sweetwater County will be protected. All proposed lands actions and other activities within view of the highway will be evaluated for impacts and will require mitigation to protect the scenic and historic values of this area. Class II visual resource management classifications on public lands will be retained.
	VRM-11–Suitable wild horse herd viewing areas may be developed to enhance public viewing of horses. Viewing areas and a half-mile distance surrounding them will be closed to long-term or permanent intrusions and surface disturbing activities that could interfere with opportunities to view horses (e.g., structures, mineral activities, powerlines, roads, etc.). Short-term intrusions that will blend with the landscape or will benefit the intent of the wild horse herd viewing areas will be considered on a case-by-case basis.
WATERSHED/SOILS MANAGEMENT	WATER-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To stabilize and conserve soils; (2) To increase vegetative production; (3) To maintain or improve surface and ground water quality; and (4) To protect, maintain, or improve wetlands, floodplains, and riparian areas.
	WATER-4- Maintaining and improving drainage channel stability.
	WATER-5- Restoring damaged wetland areas. Exclosures will be designed to allow ample water for livestock and allow minimum impediments to big game migration.
	WATER-16–Aquifer recharge areas will be managed to protect ground water quality and to ensure continued ability for recharging aquifers. Protection will be provided by limiting road density and surface occupancy to maintain a healthy recharge area. Vegetative cover and geologic soil conditions that are conducive to ground water recharge will be maintained.
	WATER-18 Areas may be considered for acquisition under a willing seller/willing buyer situation to enhance BLM management of watershed resources.
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT	WLIFE-1–MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: (1) To maintain, improve, or enhance the biological diversity of plant and wildlife species while ensuring healthy ecosystems, and (2) To restore disturbed or altered habitat, with the objective of attaining desired native plant communities, while providing for wildlife needs and soil stability.
	WLIFE-2–The objectives for management of wetlands/riparian areas are (1) tTo achieve a healthy and productive condition for long-term benefits and values in concert with range, watershed, and wildlife needs; and (2) To enhance or maintain riparian habitats by managing for deep-rooted native herbaceous or woody vegetation.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
	WLIFE-3–The objective for management of threatened, endangered, special status, and sensitive plant and animal species is to provide, maintain, or improve habitat through vegetative manipulation, mitigation measures, or other management actions, including habitat acquisition and easements. WLIFE-6–High-value wildlife habitats will be maintained or improved by reducing habitat loss or alteration and by applying appropriate distance and seasonal restrictions and rehabilitation standards to all appropriate activities. These habitats include crucial winter habitat, parturition areas, and sensitive fisheries habitat. WLIFE-7–Big game crucial winter ranges and parturition areas will be protected to ensure continued usability by limiting activities during critical seasons of use and by limiting the amount of habitat disturbed. WLIFE-12–Active and historic raptor nesting sites will be protected and managed for continued nesting activities. An active raptor nest is one that has been occupied within the past 3 years; an historic nesting site is an area of high topographic relief, particularly cliff areas, known to have supported concentrations of nesting raptors WLIFE-14–Nesting raptors will be protected through restricting disruptive activities seasonally within a one-half-mile to 1-mile radius of occupied raptor nesting sites. WLIFE-15–Raptor nest surveys will be conducted within a 1-mile radius or linear distance of proposed surface uses or activities, if such activities are proposed to be conducted during raptor nesting seasons (usually between February 1 and July 31).
MANAGEMENT AREAS ON BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS	
SUGARLOAF BASIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA	MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The management objectives for the area are to: 1) improve watershed condition and enhance watershed values; 2) improve riparian areas to proper functioning condition, as a minimum; 3) provide opportunities for dispersed recreation uses in the area consistent with the primary watershed, riparian, and wildlife objectives; and 4) maintain and protect important wildlife habitat. The Sugarloaf Basin SMA will be managed as an avoidance area for rights-of-way and surface disturbing activities. The SMA is open to mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities with appropriate mitigation requirements (controlled surface use) applied to protect all other resource values.

Resource	Objectives and Actions
	Activities that preclude the achievement or maintenance of proper functioning condition of uplands and riparian areas and achievement of other management objectives in the area are prohibited.
	Forested areas will be managed primarily toward meeting the watershed, riparian, wildlife, and recreation objectives for the area. Timber harvest levels and logging practices will be designed to help meet those objectives.
	Any increase in vegetative production will be reserved for watershed stabilization and improvement purposes.
	Management of habitat or special status species, if identified, will be developed on a case-by-case basis.
	Restrictions for protection of raptors, big game crucial winter range, and big game calving/fawning areas will apply
	Aquifer recharge zones in the area will be managed to protect groundwater quality and aquifer function.
	The area will be managed consistent with the Class II and Class III visual resource management classifications.
GREATER RED CREEK ACEC	MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES: The management objectives for the area are to: 1) improve watershed condition and enhance watershed values, including, but not limited to, improving channel stability, vegetation diversity and abundance, and water quality; 2) improve riparian areas that are at less than proper functioning condition to proper functioning condition as a minimum; 3) repair, improve, or maintain Colorado River cutthroat trout habitat in Red, Currant, Trout, and Sage Creeks and their tributaries; 4) provide opportunities for dispersed recreation uses in the area that are consistent with the primary watershed, riparian, and fisheries management objectives; 5) allow the recreation user the opportunity to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment, to have moderate challenge, and to use outdoor skills; 6) maintain important wildlife

Resource	Objectives and Actions
	habitat; 7) preserve scenic resources; and 8) reduce the amount of sediment being delivered to the Green River through Red Creek by reducing accelerated sheet, rill, gully, and channel erosion. All resource and land uses in the area will be managed in support of watershed stability and Colorado River cutthroat trout habitat management objectives. The Greater Red Creek ACEC will, in general, be managed as an avoidance area for rights-of- way and surface disturbing activities. Most of the area is open to mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities with appropriate mitigation requirements applied to protect the other important resource values. Any activity that could preclude the achievement of proper functioning condition of uplands and riparian areas and achievement of other management objectives is prohibited Re-introduction of Colorado River cutthroat trout and other native species will be considered if consistent with watershed and riparian objectives. Aquifer recharge zones in the area will be managed to protect groundwater quality. Off-road vehicle travel on BLM-administered public lands within the area is limited to designated roads and trails. The watershed (about 52,270 acres) will be managed consistent with the Class III visual resource management classification.

APPENDIX F

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Conditions of Approval

1. This authorization is contingent upon receipt of and compliance with all appropriate federal, state, county and local, permits.

2. Verbal notification shall be given to the Authorized Officer's representative at least 48 hours in advance of access road/well pad construction, seeding, and the initiation of any reclamation work, including the reduction of the drill pad to a well pad.

3. The spud date will be reported orally to the Authorized Officer's representative 48 HOURS PRIOR TO SPUDDING, unless otherwise required in site specific conditions of approval.

4. Verbal notification shall be given to the Authorized Officer's representative at least 24 hours in advance of formation tests, Blowout Prevention Equipment tests, running and cementing casing (other than conductor casing), and drilling over lease expiration dates.

5. Drilling progress reports shall be filed directly to the Rock Springs Field Office on a weekly basis.

6. All Blow-out Prevention Equipment shall be isolated from the casing and tested to stack working pressure.

7. All Blow-out Prevention Equipment tests shall be performed by a suitable test pump, not the rig-mud pumps, and recorded on a chart. The chart shall be submitted to the Rock Springs Field Office.

8. When crossing private surface 43 CFR 3814 regulations must be complied with and when crossing public surface off-lease the operator must have an approved rights-of-way agreement.

9. The operator is responsible for informing all persons associated with this project that they shall be subject to prosecution for damaging, altering, excavating or removing any archaeological, historical, or vertebrate fossil objects or sites. If archaeological, historical, or vertebrate fossil materials are discovered, the Operator is to suspend all operations that further disturb such materials and immediately contact the Authorized Officer. Operations are not to resume until written authorization to proceed is issued by the Authorized Officer.

   Within five (5) working days, the Authorized Officer will evaluate the discovery and inform the Operator of actions that will be necessary to prevent loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The Operator is responsible for the cost of any mitigation required by the Authorized Officer. The Authorized Officer will provide technical and procedural guidelines for the implementation of mitigation. Upon verification from the Authorized Officer that the required mitigation has been completed, the Operator will be allowed to resume operations.

10. The Operator shall notify the Authorized Officer, by telephone, with written confirmation, immediately upon the discovery of human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony. The Operator shall immediately stop all activities in the vicinity of the discovery and protect it until notified to proceed by the Authorized Officer

11. The operator shall be responsible for the prevention and suppression of fires on public lands caused by its employees, contractors or subcontractors. During conditions of extreme fire danger, surface use operations may be limited or suspended in specific areas.

12. A Sundry Notice must be submitted and approved prior to cuttings pit closure or reclamation work. An additional Sundry Notice (subsequent report) must be submitted including the date of initial seeding and a copy of the seed tags used for each well location.

13. The Operator must comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, existing or hereafter enacted or promulgated, with regard to any Hazardous Materials (Hazmat), as defined in this paragraph, that will be used, produced, transported, stored on or within any of the area affected by this proposal, or used in the construction, operation, maintenance, or termination of operations. "Hazardous Materials" means any substance, pollutant, or contaminant that is listed as hazardous under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq. The definition of hazardous substance under CERCLA includes any "Hazardous Waste" as defined in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, and also includes any nuclear or byproduct as defined by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. 42 U.S.C. 2011 et seq. The term does not include petroleum, including crude oil or any fraction thereof that is not otherwise specifically listed or designated as a hazardous substance under CERCLA section 101(14), 42 U.S.C. 9601(14), nor does the term include natural gas.

    The Operator agrees to indemnify the United States against any liability arising from the release of any hazardous substance or hazardous waste (as these terms are defined in the CERCLA, 421 U.S.C. 9601, et seq. or RCRA, 42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) resulting from the Proposed action (unless the release or threatened release is wholly unrelated to the Proposed Action). This agreement applies without regard to whether a release is caused by the Operator, its agent, or unrelated parties.

14. Construction activity shall not be conducted using frozen or saturated soil material, or during periods when watershed damage is likely to occur.

15. Rat and mouse holes shall be filled and compacted from the bottom to the top immediately upon release of the drilling rig from the location.

16. All vehicles shall use only authorized access roads, as depicted in this approval. Vehicles shall not use any other access route into the drill/well pad and any ancillary facilities including, but not limited to any two-tracks and pipeline rights-of-way.

17. The lease holder shall be responsible for control of all invasive/noxious weed species on any and all disturbed sites. The lease holder is responsible for consultation with the BLM Authorized Officer and/or local authorities for acceptable weed control methods, and shall comply with the following:

    Use of pesticides/herbicides shall comply with all applicable Federal and State laws. Pesticides/herbicides shall be used only in accordance with their registered uses, within limitations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior. Prior to the use of the pesticides/herbicides, the lease holder shall obtain from the Authorized Officer, written approval of a Pesticide/Herbicide Use Proposal Plan showing the type and quantity of material to be used, pest(s) to be controlled, method of application, locations of storage and disposal of containers, and any other information deemed necessary by the Authorized Officer.

    Applicator(s) of chemicals used must have completed the pesticide/herbicide certification training and have a current up-to-date Certified Pesticide/Herbicide Applicator's License.

18. All graveling of roads and well pad turn-around areas must be completed no later than one (1) year, after the completion of drilling activities.

19. Any disturbance outside of the construction corridors for roads must have prior written approval.

20. Prior to any new surface-disturbing activities between February 1 and July 31, Devon or their contractor would survey all areas within one mile of proposed surface disturbance for the presence of raptor nests. If occupied/active raptor nests are found, construction would not occur between a ½ to 1-mile radius during the critical nesting season, depending on raptor species.

21. There is a no surface disturbance stipulation for the South Well from November 15 to April 30 for big game crucial winter range.

    The lease holder may request an exception in writing to the above stipulation. Any exceptions to the stipulation must be approved in writing by the AO prior to conducting any surface disturbing activities or prior to conducting activities disruptive to wildlife. The exception request must explain the reason(s) for the exception, why the proposed activities will not impact the species or their habitat, and the dates for which the exception is requested. Data supporting the exception must accompany the written request.

22. The recommended seed mix for the proposal area is shown below. These species are suitable to the area and have the best chance to successfully revegetate disturbed areas. Reseeding should be completed after September 1 and prior to ground frost, or after frost has melted and prior to May 15. Fall seeding after the potential for germination is the preferred method. Additional seeding may be necessary in order to attain successful revegetation where soils are stable and vegetative composition and establishment are similar to other naturally occurring disturbances. At that time BLM determines the reclamation is acceptable for bond release.

    BLM APPROVED SEED MIX A – Loamy Clay

    Grasses – USE ALL

	lbs/acre
Thickspike wheatgrass	6
Indian ricegrass	2
Sandberg bluegrass or Bluebunch wheatgrass	6
Bottlebrush squirreltail	2

    Shrubs – USE TWO, (in winter range – use big sagebrush)

	lbs/acre
Basin or Wyoming big sagebrush	1
shadscale	1
winterfat	2
Gardners saltbush	2
Four wing saltbush	2

    Forbs – USE TWO

	lbs/acre
scarlet globemallow	½
lupine	½

blue flax	¼
Rocky Mountain penstemon	1/2

BLM APPROVED SEED MIX B – Sandy

Grasses – USE ALL

	lbs/acre
Needle and thread grass	6
Thickspike wheatgrass	6
Indian ricegrass	3
Bottlebrush squirreltail	2
Bluebunch wheatgrass	2

Shrubs – USE TWO, (in winter range – use big sagebrush)

	lbs/acre
shadscale	1
spiny hopsage	1

Forbs – USE TWO

	lbs/acre
Northern Sweetvetch	½
Louisiana (Prairie) sagebrush	½

23. All reclamation shall be completed in accordance with Onshore Order No. 1.

The lease holder may request an exception in writing to the above Conditions of Approval. Any exceptions to the Conditions of Approval must have prior written approval from the AO. The exception requests must explain the reason(s) for the exception, and the conditions that exist that would no longer require the Conditions ofApproval. All data supporting the exception must accompany the written request.

Decisions on waivers, exceptions, or modifications submitted after drilling has commenced are final and are not subject to administrative review by the State Director or appeal pursuant to 43 CFR part 4.