

FOR:  
CONNIE  
DARUK

# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name: Plains Pipeline, L.P.	Proposed Implementation Date: October 8, 2004
Proponent: Plains Pipeline, L. P. Po Box 708, Belfield, ND 58622	
Type and Purpose of Action: Install a pipeline gathering system. .	
Location: T24N R58E S16 SE¼  T24N R56E S16 All  T24N R55E S16 All  T25N R54E S36 All  T25N R53E S36 All	County: Richland  <div style="text-align: center;">                       NOV 7 2004                      LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL                      POLICY OFFICE                 </div>

## I. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED: Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.	The Plains Pipeline, L. P. contacted ELO and proposed a pipeline. PPLP provided a survey route map of the proposed pipeline and staked the lands. I performed field review on October 6, 2004. Discussions were held with Gary and Pamela Jackson and Dave Viara concerning this project.
2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:	310 permit if required by the Richland County Conservation District.  MDOT for crossing of Highways (24N 58E S16, SE¼)
3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:	Grant Permission to construct and maintain the pipeline.  Deny permission to construct and maintain the pipeline.

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS
	N = Not Present or No Impact will occur. Y = Impacts may occur (explain below)

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

## 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there unusual geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?

T24N R58E S16 SE¼ - This parcel is primarily TH range site on the west side of the highway. On the east side of the highway a MDOT created wetlands is present. Additionally, the proponent is proposing to cross a wetlands. Soils are stable and are not fragile.

T24N R56E S16 All - This parcel is primarily TH range site. There are deep draws filled with hardwood tree species and shrub species. These draws are of a sensitive nature and tree regeneration is difficult to achieve. Measures should be taken to minimize disturbance of these areas and protect larger trees that have the potential to regenerate.

T24N R55E S16 All - The pipeline on this parcel will cross primarily CRP lands. Soils have been disturbed previously.

T25N R54E S36 All - This range site is primarily SI range. Soils appear to be deep and very stable.

T25N R53E S36 All - The range on this tract is both SI and TH range. The TH range has shallow soils over the top of sandstone. The SI range is deep soils. There is also cropland that is present. A deep headcut is present.

Action Alternative: The implementation of this action can be done in a manner that minimizes the damages to the land. Reroutes (deviation from the proposed route) needs to take place in T24N R56E S16 in order to minimize the disturbance to the more fragile soils of the streambed. Topsoils should be scraped of to a depth of at least 5" and safeguarded from erosion for revegetation purposes. This topsoil should be evenly redistributed across the backfill

No Action: Implementation of the no action will not effect soils.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?

T24N R58E S16 SE¼ - The route of this pipeline will go through a created MDOT wetlands. The proponent is proposing to bore under these wetlands. Past experiences with this technique have proven successful. However, boring may actually drain wetlands in certain conditions.

T24N R56E S16 All - The proponent proposes to cross two (4) deep draws that convey ephemeral water. On two of these draws there is livestock reservoirs located upstream from the proposed stream crossing. On a third crossing there present is a ranch road that is located slightly upstream that has already disturbed the woody vegetation and subsoil.

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	<p>T24N R55E S16 All - The pipeline on this parcel will cross a single water ephemeral water drainage.</p> <p>T25N R54E S36 All – No significant water sources are known to exist on this tract.</p> <p>T25N R53E S36 All – The proposed pipeline route will cross one ephemeral drainage on the W½W½NW¼. .</p> <p>Action: Using mitigation measures to relocate the pipeline will minimize the disturbance of the ephemeral draws. The relocations will limit the crossings to areas where the ephemeral draws are not as wide, and to areas where significant disturbances have already taken place.</p> <p>No Action: No effect on these resources.</p>
<p>6.AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?</p>	<p>[ N ]</p> <p>Action: Pollutants and air particulates will be increased by the project. Dirt particles as well as pollutant air particles will increase during the construction stage. After construction, the air born particles will return to their normal state.</p> <p>No Action: No effect</p>
<p>7.VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>[ ] T24N R58E S16 SE¼ - This parcel is primarily TH range site on the west side of the highway. TH dominate grass species include Scsc, Agsm, Calo, bogr, kopy. On the east side of the highway a MDOT created wetlands is present. Wetlands species include Carex spp. Phar, Brin. Small Grain crops are also located west of the highway.</p> <p>T24N R56E S16 All - This parcel is primarily TH range site. There are deep draws filled with hardwood tree species and shrub species. These draws are of a sensitive nature and tree regeneration is difficult to achieve. Draw tree species observed include Fram, Ulam, Prvi, Shar, Pode, and Rhal. TH dominate rass species include Scsc, Agsm, Calo, bogr, kop. Measures should be taken to minimize disturbance of these areas and protect larger trees that have the potential to regenerate.</p> <p>T24N R55E S16 All - The pipeline on this parcel will cross primarily CRP lands. CRP vegetation is Agcr and Mesa. Soils have been disturbed previously.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	<p>T25N R54E S36 All - This range site is primarily SI range. Dominant species include Agsm, Kpy, STco, Bogry, and Cafi. .</p> <p>T25N R53E S36 All - The range on this tract is both SI and TH range. The TH range has shallow soils over the top of sandstone. TH dominate grass species include Scsc, Agsm, Calo, bogr, kopy The SI range is deep soils. SI dominant species include Agsm, Kpy, STco, Bogry, and Cafi There is also cropland that is present. A deep headcut is present. The area where the project is proposed is presently in native vegetation. The primary grass species is western wheatgrass, blue grama, and needle and thread grass. At the date of the site inspection, no rare plants were observed.</p> <p>Action: The proposed route will have impacts on the draw and woody species. Route should be altered to avoid the disturbance of these areas when possible, and to routed in a manner as to minimize the disturbance when crossing are unavoidable. Revegetation of navie Soils should be drill seeded at a rate of 10 # PLS per acre consisting of:</p> <p>Thickspike Wheatgrass2 # PLS/ac</p> <p>Western Wheatgrass 4 # PLS/ac</p> <p>Slender Wheatgrass 4 #PLS/ac.</p> <p>No Action: No effect</p>
<p>8.TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>[ M ] The area where the project is proposes has no documented use of important wildlife, birds or fish. Crucial wintering grounds for species are found in the hardwood draws found within this project area. Disturbance will take p</p> <p>Action: Disturbance will take place in the fall of the year, prior to</p> <p>No Action: No effect.</p>
<p>9.UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Sensitive Species or Species of special concern?</p>	<p>[ N ] Numerous species of concerned are listed for this area. The project is small in scope and will not effect these species.</p> <p>Action: No effect.</p>

II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	<p>No Action: No effect.</p>
<p>10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>[ Y ] During the on-site inspection sites were observed.</p> <p>T24N R58E S16 SE¼ - A rock cairn exist on the West side of the highway. DNRC's archeologist is in the process of document this site with SHIPO. For now the site will be referred to as PPLP Site 1. This site is a rock Cairn, circular in nature, 1-2 meters in diameter. The proposed pipeline will disturb this feature.</p> <p>T24N R56E S16 All - No cultural sites were observed on the pipeline or on the reroute.</p> <p>T24N R55E S16 All - No cultural sites were observed on the pipeline or on the reroute</p> <p>T25N R54E S36 All - The pipeline route was not flagged at the time of my inspection. There are rock cairns that are present on the buttes of the hilltops. If the route of the pipeline will effect these areas, then relocating or testing needs to take place.</p> <p>T25N R53E S36 All - A cultural sites rock cairn was observed but was not in the proposed pipeline route.</p> <p>Action Alternative: Reroute of the pipeline can be done to avoid the feature located in 24N 58E S16. Once the route is flagged in 25N 58E S16, then impacts can be assessed, and if necessary a reroute may take place.</p> <p>No Action: No effect.</p>
<p>11. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?</p>	<p>[ ] This area is accessible to the public. Intense oil activities are taking place in this area.</p> <p>Action: The installation of the pipeline will be visible during the construction phase. After construction, the pipeline will not be noticeable.</p> <p>No Action: 24v11763</p>
<p>12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?</p>	<p>[ ]</p> <p>Action: The action alternative will increase oil production by providing a more reliable means of</p>

## II. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

	delivery of the oil.
	No Action: The oil output will not be increased.
13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA: Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?	[ ] none.

## III. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[ ] Action: The installation of the line and maintenance of the line will increase the health and safety risks for the people using the area. No Action: No additional risk will be encountered.
15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[ ] Action: The implementation of the action alternative will positive effect the industrial and commercial oil industries. The project will also influence local contracts. No Action: The no action alternative will negatively effect the commercial industries. Potential available resources will not be extracted to their fullest potential.
16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[ ] Action: The project has the potential to create jobs by with the further development. No Action: The no action alternative will not add to the potential job market.
17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX Revenues: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[ ] Action: The action alternative will increase the TLMD revenue. The School Trust will receive a royalty for the sale of the corridor.

	No Action: The no action alternative will not create additional tax revenue.
18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc) be needed?	[ ] Action: No. Oil development in these areas has already drastically increased traffic demands. This project will not add to existing traffic demands. No Action: No effect.
19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[ ] Action: The action alternative will not effect State, County, City, USFS, BLM or Tribal management plans. No Action No effect.
20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	[ ] Action: No impacts. No Action: No effect.
21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[ ] Action: Additional housing will not be added by this project, nor will there be density or distribution changes in the local population. No Action: No effect
22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[ ] Action: Native or traditional lifestyles will not be effected. No Action: No Effect.
23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[ ] Action: No unique shift in some unique quality of this area will take place by implementation of this proposal. No Action:
24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC	[ ]

CIRCUMSTANCES:	Action :None  No Action: None.
----------------	--------------------------------------

EA Checklist Prepared By: R. Hoyt Richards Date: October 7, 2004  
R. Hoyt Richards Glasgow Unit Manager

IV. FINDING	
25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:  Action	
26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:	
27. Need for Further Environmental Analysis:  <input type="checkbox"/> EIS <input type="checkbox"/> More Detailed EA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Further Analysis	

EA Checklist Approved By: Rich Stohmeyer EO Area Manager  
Name Title

Rich Stohmeyer  
Signature

Date: October 7, 2004