

## APPENDIX A

### A-1 ACCEPTED MITIGATING MEASURES FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WY-090-EA01-099

#### 4.1.6.3 Paleontology

To reduce the potential for impacts to potential fossil resources, the following mitigation measures could be implemented (Table 4-1). As described in (EVG, 2001) these measures include the following:

**G-1 Worker Instruction.** Construction personnel would be instructed about the types of fossils they could encounter and the steps to take if they uncover fossils during construction. Instruction should stress the nonrenewable nature of paleontologic resources, and that collection or excavation of vertebrate and significant invertebrate or plant fossil materials from federal land without a federal permit is illegal, and that fossils are part Wyoming's prehistoric heritage and should be preserved for study.

**G-2 Discovery Contingency.** If suspected fossil materials are uncovered during construction, the operator should stop work immediately and contact the BLM administrative officer (AO) who would assess the situation and advise whether any mitigating measures need to be undertaken before operations can continue.

**G-3 Field Survey.** Detailed field surveys would be conducted within the HTPA where construction would disturb rocks of the Green River, Wasatch, and Gannett Group (which meet BLM Condition 2). Field survey involves a visual examination of the formation in areas of exposure. The level of field survey may be downgraded by the paleontologist conducting the field survey from detailed to spot check in specific cases where warranted. For example, this would be applicable in areas depicted on maps as being underlain by a geologic unit with high potential that in actuality is covered by vegetation or a veneer of unfossiliferous Recent sediments. In such a case detailed field survey would not be warranted.

Spot Checks are recommended for areas underlain by the Bear River and Aspen Formations based on the lower probability of finding significant fossil specimens. Spot checking involves a visual check of representative well-exposed outcrops of the geologic unit in the area of potential disturbance. If fossils of significance are discovered then a detailed survey in the vicinity of the discovery is recommended.

Field survey would determine the need for additional mitigation and the need for paleontological investigation of future proposed oil and gas facilities. Should field surveys reveal the presence of fossils of scientific significance, additional mitigation may be recommended. These mitigating measures could include. (1) collection and curation of specimens, (2) monitoring of excavation

in areas of particularly high paleontologic potential; (3) submission of a letter report describing the results of collection and monitoring. If field survey does not reveal significant fossils, no additional work for paleontology may be recommended.

***INSERT TABLE 4-1***

**4.2.6 Air Quality**

The emission inventory used as a basis for this analysis assumed that compressor engines would have an average potential NO<sub>x</sub> emission rate of approximately 2 grams per horsepower-hour (g/hp-hr) of operation. This reflects emission control levels which have already been required in similar applications, although WDEQ-AQD operating permit records have shown existing facility hourly emission levels to be substantially less. Alternate NO<sub>x</sub> control measures include reducing compression requirements, electric compression, or the use of nonselective catalytic reduction (NCR), lean combustion, and/or selective catalytic reduction (SCR) control technologies.

**4.3.5 Soils**

Measures to conserve soil, prevent erosion, and expeditiously reclaim disturbed surface are described in Chapter 2. These measures, specifically those described under Section 2.2.2.10.2 (Preconstruction Planning and Design Measures) of the EA, for soils, would prevent significant impacts to soils.

In addition, general avoidance of slopes greater than 25% is common practice within the Kemmerer Field Office and should be continued with this project. Roads and well pads should be graveled at the on-set of drilling unless waived by the authorized officer (AO). Standard practices applicable to runoff control and site stabilization should be stringently applied to those areas with a high erosion potential. These practices would include: armoring of culvert outlets, wing ditches along road borrow ditches, road surfacing, control of runoff from pads, use of erosion control matting on steep cuts, and timely reseeding of roads, unused areas of producing wells, and abandoned well pads and roads. A minimum of 6 inches of topsoil should be salvaged on all disturbed areas. Consideration should be given to fencing of reclaimed areas to prohibit use by livestock until the vegetation is adequately rooted and to protect sites that are in proximity to a water source. The BLM may also require that vertical banks along existing drainages that are cut back during construction be restored to their approximate original contour and stabilized during reclamation.

The survey upon which the soil types have been identified ( the Slate Creek Soil Survey, 1991, on file in the Kemmerer and Rock Springs Field Offices) in the Condor area was designed for watershed planning and is very general. Therefore, a site by site investigation to verify the affected soil type(s) is recommended for the siting of pads and roads.

**4.4.5 Water Quality**

Condor proposes to implement mitigation measures and procedures on public land to avoid or mitigate resource or other land use impacts. These measures would be applied on privately owned surface and State of Wyoming lands unless otherwise specified by the involved private and/or State owners. An exception to a mitigation measure and/or design feature may be approved on public land on a case-by-case basis when deemed appropriate by the BLM. An exception would be approved only after a thorough, site-specific analysis determined that the resource or land use for which the measure was put in place is not present or would not be significantly impacted.

No additional measures beyond those proposed by Condor in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.10.2 of the EA, and management direction contained in the RMP would be required to minimize adverse impacts to water resources.

#### **4.5.5 Vegetation and Wetlands**

Given the implementation of the mitigation and avoidance measures outlined in Chapter 2, Sections 2.2.2.9 through 2.2.2.10.2 of the EA, the adherence to existing management directions outlined in Chapter 4, Section 4.5.1 of the EA, and the additional measures described below, significant impacts to vegetation, wetlands, and rare plants are not expected.

- Monitoring should occur for weed species identified by the State of Wyoming and the BLM. Should weed species be found during monitoring, control and eradication efforts should be implemented following County control procedures. Further, construction contractors should be required to clean vehicles and equipment of weed seed prior to entering the project area.

#### **4.7.5 Wildlife**

- To avoid the displacement of sage grouse from the project area, no surface disturbance shall occur within 1/4 mile of an identified sage grouse lek.

Condor has prepared an acceptable wildlife mitigation plan that describes how anticipated impacts to wildlife will be mitigated within the HTPA. This plan may include development, operations, as well as the number, location, and maintenance of facilities. The plan will specifically address protection of big game crucial winter range.

Given the implementation of the mitigation and avoidance measures outlined in Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.10.2 of the EA, the adherence to existing management direction, and the additional measures that were presented within the discussions for the Proposed Action that were developed in response to potential impacts on the species identified, significant impacts to wildlife are not expected.

#### **4.8.6 Fisheries**

Any water depletions from tributary waters within the Colorado River drainage are considered

as jeopardizing the continued existence of the endangered Colorado River fishes. Those projects involving water depletions require formal Section 7 consultation.

The USFWS may determine through formal Section 7 consultation that progress made under the RIP has been sufficient to merit waiver of the mitigation fee for depletions of 100 acre-feet or less (Memorandum dated March 9, 1995 to Assistant Regional Director, Ecological Services, Region 6, from Regional Director 6, "Intra-Service Section 7 Consultation for Elimination of Fees for Water Depletions of 100 acre-feet or Less from the Upper Colorado River Basin"). This Proposed Action would deplete approximately 40-acre feet per year for the entire project, and thus the mitigation fee may not be required for this project.

#### **4.11.6 Cultural Resources**

Mitigation procedures would be implemented if a site considered eligible or listed on the National Register is impacted. Avoidance is preferred and is achieved through redesign of a project, elimination of the project, or minimizing impacts. However, these means are not always possible. Mitigation of adverse effects to properties would be accomplished by the documentation of physical remains. Mitigation would include data recovery of prehistoric and historic sites and could include documentation through detailed drawings and photographs of standing structures. Data recovery plans are subject to review and approval by the BLM and concurrence by SHPO, pursuant to BLM State Protocol agreement.

For properties evaluated eligible under Criteria a, b, or c, with contributing qualities of integrity of setting, feeling or association, mitigation would involve view shed analyses and measures to reduce visibility of new developments in their environmental settings.

## **WILDLIFE MITIGATION PLAN**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This wildlife contingency plan was prepared in conjunction with the Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (EA/FONSI) for the Horse Trap Project Area (HTPA), Lincoln County, Wyoming. The main goal of the contingency plan is to avoid and/or minimize adverse impacts to wildlife present on project-affected areas. Implementation of the plan will also allow land managers and project personnel opportunities to achieve and maintain desired levels of wildlife productivity and populations on the HTPA (e.g., at pre-project levels) by minimizing and/or avoiding potential adverse impacts to wildlife species. In addition, the implementation of this plan will facilitate the monitoring and maintenance of a diverse assemblage of wildlife populations on the HTPA simultaneously with the development of natural gas reserves. The proposed Horse Trap Natural Gas Project involves the development of a maximum of 24 new well locations and associated facilities (roads, pipelines) on the HTPA over a period of approximately 2 years with implementation of the plan in 2001.

### **2.0 IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOL**

This section provides preliminary wildlife inventory, monitoring, and protection protocol. A summary of primary protocol components is provided in Table A-1. (All tables are attached in back). Standard protocol for Application for Permit to Drill (APD) and right-of-way (ROW) application field reviews are provided in Table A-3. Alternative protocols likely will be developed in the future in response to specific needs identified in annual wildlife reports (see Chapter 2, Section 2.1.1 of the EA). Methods are provided for each wildlife species/category, and additional species/categories may be added based on needs identified in annual wildlife reports. The wildlife species/categories for which specific inventory, monitoring, and protection procedures will be applied were developed based on management agency (i.e., Bureau of Land Management [BLM], U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], Wyoming Game and Fish Department [WGFD]) and individual concerns identified during the preparation of the EA .

## **2.1 REPORTS AND MEETINGS**

### **2.1.1 Reports**

Condor has provided an inventory and description of all existing project features; (i.e., location, size, and associated level of human activity at each feature) in the EA Chapter 2, Proposed Action and Alternatives. This data has been coupled with wildlife inventory, monitoring, and protection data obtained during the preparation of the EA for the HTPA. Annual reports will be prepared by a Condor funded party. When annual wildlife inventory, monitoring, and protection data are gathered by parties other than the BLM, those parties (e.g., Condor, WGFD) will be requested to provide the data to the BLM by November 15 of each calendar year. Upon receipt of this data, annual reports will be completed in draft form by the Condor funded party and submitted to the BLM, Condor, USFWS, and other interested parties no later than January 30 of the following year. A one-day meeting of the aforementioned parties will be organized by the BLM following completion of the report to discuss and modify, as necessary, proposed wildlife inventory, monitoring, and protection protocol for the subsequent year.

### **2.1.2 Additional Meetings**

Meetings will be held as necessary in any given year by the BLM and Condor at the Kemmerer Field Office to inform and update Condor personnel on the findings of the annual reports. Relevant wildlife laws, rules, and regulations may be discussed, as will project-specific wildlife monitoring and protection protocol for the upcoming year. Condor and other interested parties will have the opportunity to provide annual input regarding proposed inventory, monitoring, and protection measures; however, the BLM will maintain the authority for determining the final nature of these activities in any given year. Additional information on the nature of the wildlife present in the HTPA, potential impacts to wildlife, appropriate Condor responses to wildlife encounters to avoid or minimize impacts, and other items (e.g., species identification) also may be presented at these meetings as deemed necessary and specified in annual reports and the wildlife mitigation plan will be assessed and modified as necessary to protect wildlife.

## **2.2 ANNUAL INVENTORY AND MONITORING**

Inventory and monitoring protocol will be as identified below for each wildlife species/category. These protocol will be unchanged across development alternatives, except as authorized by the BLM or specified in this plan. Additional wildlife species/categories and associated surveys may be added or wildlife species/categories and surveys may be omitted in future years, pending results presented in the coordinated review of annual wildlife reports. The WGFD will be contacted during the coordination of survey and other data acquisition phases. Opportunistic wildlife observations may be made throughout the year by agency and Condor personnel present in the HTPA.

The following sections identify the minimum level of effort required by this wildlife plan. Site- and species-specific surveys will continue to be conducted in association with APD and ROW application field reviews (see Table A-3).

### **2.2.1 Raptors**

A raptor inventory of potentially affected areas was conducted from the air by Hayden-Wing Associates in May 2001 to determine the location of raptor nests/territories and their activity status. Results of the survey will be included in the 2001 annual report.

Nest productivity monitoring will be conducted by the BLM at active nests that are located within 1 mile of project-required disturbance areas between March 1 and mid-July to determine nesting success (i.e., number of nestlings/fledglings). These surveys generally will be conducted from the ground, and attempts will be made to determine the cause of any documented nest failure. Inventory/monitoring efforts in these areas, as well as selected undeveloped comparison areas, will be conducted annually during April and May, followed by nest productivity monitoring. Site- and species-specific raptor nest inventories will also continue to be conducted as necessary in association with all APD and ROW application field reviews (see Table A-3).

All raptor nest/productivity surveys will be conducted using procedures that minimize potential adverse effects to nesting raptors. Specific survey measures for reducing detrimental effects are listed in Grier and Fyfe (1987) and Call (1978) and include the following.

- Nest visits will be delayed for as long as possible in the nesting season.
- Nests will be approached cautiously, and their status (i.e., number of nestlings/fledglings) will be determined from a distance with binoculars or a spotting scope.
- Nests will be approached tangentially and in an obvious manner to avoid startling adults.
- Nests will not be visited during adverse weather conditions (e.g., extreme cold, precipitation events, windy periods, hottest part of the day).
- Visits will be kept as brief as possible and in no instance will be greater than 10 minutes.

- All inventories will be coordinated by the BLM.
- The number of nest visits in any year will be kept to a minimum.
- All raptor nest location data will be considered confidential.

## **2.2.2 Threatened, Endangered, Candidate, and Other Species of Concern**

The level of inventory/monitoring required for threatened, endangered, candidate, and other species of concern (TEC&SC) will be commensurate with established protocol for the potentially affected species. Methodologies and results of these surveys will be included in annual reports or provided in separate supplemental reports. A preliminary list of TEC&SC species proposed for management and known from or potentially occurring in the vicinity of the HTPA is shown on Table A-4. As TEC&SC species are added to or withdrawn from USFWS, BLM, and/or WGFD lists, appropriate modifications will be incorporated to this plan and specified in annual reports. Additional species of concern known to occur or potentially occurring in the vicinity of the HTPA are shown on Table A-2.

TEC&SC data collected during the surveys identified in Tables A-2 and A-3 and described below will be considered confidential and will be provided only as necessary to those requiring the data for specific management and/or project development needs. Site- and species-specific TEC&SC surveys will continue to be conducted as necessary in association with all APD and ROW application field reviews (see Table A-3). Data will be collected on appropriate General Wildlife Observation Data Sheets or other similar forms. Alternate/additional forms may be used as specified by the BLM.

### **2.2.2.1 Black-footed Ferret**

BLM-approved Condor-financed biologists will determine the presence/absence of prairie dog colonies at each proposed development site during APD and ROW application field revisions (see Table A-3). White Tailed Prairie dog colonies (i.e., potential black-footed ferret habitat) on the area will be mapped and burrow densities determined by a BLM-approved Condor-financed biologist, as necessary and in association with proposed development plans (i.e., APD and ROW application reviews). Colonies that meet USFWS criteria as potential black-footed ferret habitat (USFWS 1989) will be surveyed for black-footed ferrets by a certified Condor-financed surveyor prior to BLM authorizing disturbance of these colonies.

Surveys will only be conducted as deemed necessary during consultation with the BLM and/or USFWS. Black-footed ferret surveys will be conducted in accordance with current USFWS guidelines and will be conducted on a site-specific basis, depending on the areas proposed for disturbance in a given year as specified in the annual report.

Hayden-Wing Associates (BLM-approved, Condor-financed biologists) conducted a survey May 2001 and found that although there are few areas occupied by prairie dogs. These areas are small in size and low in burrow density and do not meet USFWS habitat requirements.



### **2.2.2.2 Bald Eagle and Ferruginous Hawk**

Inventory and monitoring protocol for the ferruginous hawk will be as described for raptors (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.1 of the EA).

### **2.2.2.3 Mountain Plover**

Suitable mountain plover habitat (i.e., areas with vegetation less than 4 inches high) within ¼ mile of proposed disturbance areas (as identified in annual wildlife reports) will be surveyed by the BLM or a BLM-approved Condor-financed biologist to detect the presence of plovers (see Table A-3). Any surveys conducted will follow current USFWS survey guidelines.

### **2.2.2.4 Western Burrowing Owl**

In association with APD and ROW application field reviews, prairie dog colonies and other suitable burrowing owl nesting areas (i.e., areas with large numbers of ground squirrel burrows) on and within 0.5 mi of existing and proposed disturbance areas will be searched for western burrowing owls by the BLM or a BLM-approved Operator-financed biologist during June through August to determine the presence or absence of owl nesting (see Table A-3).

### **2.2.2.5 Other TEC&SC Species**

Surveys for other TEC&SC species will be conducted by the BLM or a BLM-approved Operator-financed biologist in areas of potential habitat (see Table A-3). These surveys may be implemented in conjunction with surveys for other species or as components of APD and/or ROW application processes. If any TEC&SC species are observed, the observations will be noted on appropriate data forms. In addition, when and if TEC&SC species are observed, efforts will be made to determine their activities (e.g., breeding, nesting, foraging, hunting, etc.). If any management agency (e.g., BLM, USFWS) identifies a potential for concern regarding any of these species, additional inventory and monitoring may be implemented as specified in annual reports.

## **2.2.3 Sage Grouse**

Documented sage grouse lek locations on and within six miles of the border of the HTPA, were obtained through the BLM Kemmerer Field Office (HTPA/EA Figure 3-11). Four leks are documented within the project area boundary and 15 additional leks are documented within a 2-mile buffer of the project area boundary. Field surveys would be needed to determine which leks are currently being used by sage grouse. The approximate locations of known leks on the area are shown on HTPA/EA Figure 3-10. Inventories will be conducted by the BLM. Standard site- and species-specific sage grouse lek surveys will continue to be conducted as necessary in association with all APD and ROW application field reviews (see Table A-3).

#### **2.2.4 Big Game Crucial Winter Range**

To determine the need for the application of crucial winter range seasonal stipulations and assess potential impacts to big game species occurring on the HTPA, data on big game use of crucial winter ranges on the HTPA and an adjacent 1-mile buffer will be requested annually by the BLM from the WGFD, as deemed necessary by the BLM (see Table A-1). Big game crucial winter ranges are shown in the EA Chapter 3; Affected Environment Figure 3-6, Figure 3-7 and Figure 3-8.

#### **2.2.6 General Wildlife**

BLM staff will be responsible for keeping records of selected wildlife species observed during the course of their activities on the HTPA, and interested Condor personnel may also provide data on wildlife observations. The information provided will include observations of wildlife species, their numbers, location, activity, and other pertinent data as applicable and identified on the General Wildlife Observation Data Sheet. Some of the desired information may be difficult for Condor to define (e.g., specific locations in U.S. Geological Survey [USGS] coordinates, species type for hard to recognize species [passerine birds and small mammals], sex). Where Condor is uncertain of the USGS coordinates for an observation, a general description of the location may be provided (e.g., 100 yards north of well #\_\_\_), and in instances where species or sex information are questionable, Condor will identify the observation as such.

### **2.3 PROTECTION MEASURES**

The wildlife protection measures proposed herein have been developed from past measures identified for oil and gas developments in Wyoming. Additional measures may be included and/or existing measures may be modified in any given year as allowable and as deemed appropriate by BLM in consultation with Condor and other interested parties, and these measures will be specified in annual reports. Wildlife protection measures will be modified as necessary. Protection measures will be implemented by Condor with assistance from and/or in consultation with the BLM. In addition, these measures may be modified on a site-specific basis as deemed appropriate by the BLM after completion of APD and ROW application field reviews.

The principle protection measure for most wildlife species will be avoidance of sensitive/crucial habitats (e.g., big game crucial winter ranges, raptor nests, sage grouse leks). However, numerous species- and project-specific measures may be implemented. Additionally, general wildlife protection measures (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.5 of the EA) will likely benefit the majority of wildlife species found on and adjacent to the HTPA.

#### **2.3.1 Raptors**

The primary protection measure for raptor species on the HTPA will be avoidance of active nest location buffer footages. Active nests are defined as any raptor nest that has been used within the

last 3 years. Depending upon the timing of proposed construction and drilling activities, all surface-disturbing activities will be restricted from February 1 through July 31, within a ½ mile radius (depending upon species and site-specific conditions) for all active raptor nests/nesting territories (i.e., seasonal nest avoidance), except ferruginous hawk which will have a 1 mile restricted radius; any exceptions to this must be written and approved by the BLM. This measure may be excepted where raptor pairs are documented using alternate nests greater than 1.0 mi from the surface disturbance area within a nesting territory. In addition, well locations, roads, ancillary facilities, and other surface structures requiring a repeated human presence will not be constructed within 825 feet of active raptor nests, except ferruginous hawk and eagles, where the restriction will be to 1,970 feet (restrictions will generally exclude surface disturbance). The seasonal buffer distance and exclusion dates may vary, depending on factors such as nest activity status, species, prey availability, natural topographic barriers, and line-of-sight distances. Actual nest buffers for each active raptor nest will be established in annual reports.

The exact dates of exclusion will be determined by the BLM and will likely vary between nests and from year to year, depending on the species present and variations in weather, nesting chronology, and other factors.

Any powerline construction will follow the recommendations of the Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) (1994, 1996) and Olendorff et al. (1981) to avoid collisions and/or electrocution of raptors.

### **2.3.2 TEC&SC**

USFWS and WGFD consultation and coordination will be conducted for all protection activities relating to TEC&SC species and their habitats. Where possible, these actions will be specified in advance in the annual reports.

#### **2.3.2.1 Black-footed Ferret**

If prairie dog colonies of sufficient size and burrow density for black-footed ferrets are scheduled to be disturbed, as identified in annual reports, black-footed ferret surveys of these colonies will be conducted pursuant to BLM and/or USFWS decisions made during informal consultations. Survey protocol will adhere to current USFWS guidelines and will be conducted by a qualified biologist a maximum of one year in advance of the proposed disturbance. Reports identifying survey methods and results will be prepared and submitted to the USFWS and BLM in accordance with Section 7 of the *Endangered Species Act of 1973*, as amended, and the Interagency Cooperation Regulations.

If black-footed ferrets are found on the HTPA, the USFWS will be notified immediately and formal consultations will be initiated to develop strategies that ensure no adverse effects to the species.

#### **2.3.2.2 Bald Eagle and Ferruginous Hawk**

Protection protocol generally will be as described for raptors (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1 of the

EA). Additional measures will be applied on a species- or site-specific basis, as deemed appropriate by the USFWS and/or BLM, and specified in annual reports.

### **2.3.2.3 Mountain Plover**

Mountain plover habitats (e.g., cushion plant communities, playa lakes, areas with vegetation <4 inches in height) will be avoided where practical, and where these habitats will be disturbed, reclamation will utilize procedures designed to reestablish suitable plover habitat.

If an active mountain plover nest is observed within survey areas current USFWS guidelines will be followed. Road construction and maintenance (i.e., grading) activities will be minimized from May 25 to June 30. No new surface-disturbing activities will be conducted from April 10 to July 10 without written approval from the BLM.

### **2.3.2.4 Western Burrowing Owl**

Other than the avoidance of prairie dog colonies and other appropriate nesting habitat, during the nesting period (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3.1 of the EA), no additional species-specific protection measures are proposed.

### **2.3.2.5 Other TEC&SC Species**

If, during surveys of proposed disturbance sites (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2.5 of the EA), nests or other crucial features for any TEC&SC species are found, avoidance of these features will be accomplished in consultation and coordination with the BLM, USFWS, and WGFD. Construction activities in these areas will be curtailed until there is concurrence between BLM, USFWS, and WGFD on what activities can be authorized. Activities will be delayed until such time that no adverse effects will occur (e.g., after fledging).

### **2.3.3 Sage Grouse**

Surface disturbance and actions that create permanent and high-profile structures such as buildings, roads and storage tanks which are suitable as raptor perches will not be constructed within 0.25 mi of sage grouse leks on and adjacent to the HTPA. In addition, power lines will not be constructed within 0.6 mile of leks, as necessary to protect leks from raptor predation. To protect nesting sage grouse, Condor will restrict construction activities between April 1 and July 1 within a 2.0-mile radius of active sage grouse leks on suitable sage grouse nesting habitat as determined during on-site reviews of proposed development areas. In addition, if an active sage grouse nest is identified in an area proposed for disturbance, surface-disturbing activities will be delayed in the area until nesting is completed, and proposed disturbance areas will be relocated to avoid nest locations.

### **2.3.4 Big Game Species**

No construction activities or planned extensive maintenance actions (e.g., workovers) will be

*Decision Record, Horse Trap Natural Gas Project*

---

conducted within big game crucial winter range (CWR) on the HTPA during crucial winter periods (i.e., November 15 - April 30). Condor will be allowed access to areas on an as required basis, without prior approvals for normal operations, emergencies will require Condor give notification to the BLM.

No road or pipeline ROW fencing is proposed for the project; however, if ROW fencing is required, it will be kept to a minimum, and the fences will meet BLM/WGFD approval for facilitating wildlife movement. Fencing will be used only to enclose reclaimed areas where it is determined that wildlife and/or livestock are impeding successful vegetation establishment. Project personnel will also be advised to minimize stopping and exiting their vehicles in big game winter habitat while there is snow on the ground. In addition, escape openings will be provided along roads in big game crucial winter ranges as designated by the BLM to facilitate exit of big game animals from snowplowed roads. Additional habitat protection/improvement measures may also be applied in any given year as directed by the BLM, in consultation with Condor and other agencies, and specified in annual wildlife reports.

Potential increases in poaching will be minimized through employee and contractor education regarding wildlife laws. If violations are discovered on the HTPA, Condor will immediately report to the WGFD.

Condor will design the facilities such that the main road is not plowed during the CWR period. Pumper's visits to well sites would be accomplished by Snow Cat or snowmobile however when overall snow cover is insufficient for snow cat operation, or when operational emergencies occur requiring access by other equipment/trucks snowplowing may be necessary. A gate has been installed at the main entrance to the HTPA. This gate will be locked during the CWR period to limit travel into the CWR area.

Each well site will have meters, separation and dehydration facilities requiring pumper visits for safety, accounting and production requirements. New wells may require pumper visits approximately every 48 to 72 hours; however, after six months of production, stable wells may only require weekly visits. Wells would have enough condensate, oil, water and methanol storage facilities to last through the CWR period, or liquids would be shipped down the Slate Creek Pipeline to the end facility located outside the CWR (near the junction of US 189 and WY 240). This location for the additional storage and separation facilities is located outside of identified Elk, Moose, and Mule Deer winter ranges identified in the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan. Since the enhanced end facilities are subject to the frequent all-season access and truck traffic has been diverted out of the acknowledged Winter Ranges, an additional facilities location may be necessary.

Should any well or wells produce high amounts of water, produced water will either be stored at the well site in tanks that can hold 6 months water production or the produced water will be transported by a water pipeline to a temporary reservoir or injection well. For those wells where produced water cannot be stored onsite during the CWR period, an emergency water line would be installed in the same ROW as the gas production line and routed to a temporary reservoir. This would allow the well to produce gas during the CWR period without the periodic water haulage from the well site

which would be necessary if the emergency water system and reservoir were not available. The reservoir would be constructed using fences and/or nets to preclude wildlife access to it.

Slate Creek Pipeline pigging will be necessary during CWR to keep production levels high. Frequency of pigging for future production wells is unknown at this time. Should pigging frequency be greater than once per week, Condor will install automatic pigging equipment capable of launching 10 pigs without operator attention. Installation of liquids handling at the end facility will consist of slug catcher(s), separator(s), condensate, oil and water storage, shipping (truck loading) facilities and smokeless flare for condensate vapor combustion.

Implementation of remote monitoring for production and safety critical parameters, such as tank levels, flow volume, line temperature and pressure, and burner conditions will be implemented in an attempt to minimize pumper visits.

### **2.3.5 General Wildlife**

Unless otherwise indicated, the following protection measures will be applied for all wildlife species. Additional measures primarily designed to minimize impacts to other HTPA resources (e.g., vegetation and surface water resources, including wetlands, steep slopes, etc.) are identified in the HTPA/EA and these measures may provide additional protection for area wildlife. Additional actions may be applied in any given year to further minimize potential impacts to wildlife. These actions will be specified in annual reports.

All roads on and adjacent to the HTPA that are required for the proposed project will be appropriately constructed, improved, maintained, and signed to minimize potential wildlife/vehicle collisions and facilitate wildlife (most notably big game) movement through the HTPA. Appropriate speed limits will be adhered to on all HTPA roads, and Condor will advise employees and contractors regarding these speed limits. Some existing roads on the HTPA and surrounding transportation planning area may be reclaimed if they become redundant or closed (gated and locked) to deny unnecessary access during critical winter periods.

To protect important habitat in the HTPA (i.e., ephemeral draws dominated by basin big sagebrush) areas with sagebrush greater than 3 feet tall and aspen stands will be avoided where possible. Additional non-species-specific wildlife mitigations include the following.

- Reserve, workover, and flare pits and other locations potentially hazardous to wildlife will be adequately protected by netting and/or fencing as directed by the BLM to prohibit wildlife access.
- If dead or injured raptors, big game, migratory birds, or unusual wildlife are observed on the HTPA, Condor personnel will contact the appropriate WGFD offices.

## **3.0 LITERATURE CITED**

Avian Power Line Interaction Committee. 1994. Mitigating bird collisions with power lines: The

*Decision Record, Horse Trap Natural Gas Project*

---

- state of the art in 1994. Edison Electric Institute, Washington, D.C. 78 pp. + append.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Suggested practices for raptor protection on power lines: The state of the art in 1996. Edison Electric Institute/Raptor Research Foundation, Washington, D.C. 125 pp. + append.
- Baxter, G.T., and M.D. Stone. 1980. Amphibians and reptiles of Wyoming. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Bulletin No. 16. 137 pp.
- Call, M.W. 1978. Nesting habitats and surveying techniques for common western raptors. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Technical Note No. 316. 115 pp.
- Dorn, J.L., and R.D. Dorn. 1990. Wyoming birds. Mountain West Publishing, Cheyenne, Wyoming. 138 pp.
- Grier, J.W., and R.W. Fyfe. 1987. Preventing research and management disturbance. Pages 173-182 *In* B.A.G. Pendleton, B.A. Milsap, K.W. Cline, and D.M. Bird, editors. Raptor management techniques. Institute of Wildlife Research, National Wildlife Federation, Scientific and Technical Series No. 10. 420 pp.
- Olendorff, R.R., A.D. Miller, and R.M. Lehman. 1981. Suggested practices for raptor protection on power lines: The state of the art in 1981. Raptor Research Report No. 4, Raptor Research Foundation, Inc., University of Minnesota, St. Paul. 111 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1989. Black-footed ferret survey guidelines for compliance with the *Endangered Species Act*. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado, and Albuquerque, New Mexico (April 1989). 10 pp. + append.
- Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality-Land Quality Division. 1995. Coal rules and regulations, Appendix B, wildlife monitoring requirements for surface coal mines.
- Wyoming Game and Fish Department. 1992. Wyoming bird and mammal atlas. 170 pp.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. Wyoming observation system records. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Biological Services, Cheyenne, Wyoming.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. Atlas of birds, mammals, reptiles and amphibians in Wyoming. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Wildlife Division, Biological Services Station, Nongame Program, Lander, Wyoming. 192 pp.
- Wyoming Natural Diversity Database. 1995. Wyoming vertebrate species of concern list. Compiled by C. Garber for the Nature Conservancy, Wyoming Natural Diversity Database. 21 pp. + append.