



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Great Plains Regional Office
115 Fourth Avenue S.E., Suite 400
Aberdeen, South Dakota 57401

IN REPLY REFER TO:

DESCRM

MC-208

SEP 12 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: Superintendent, Fort Berthold Agency

FROM: Regional Director, Great Plains Region *WJK*

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

In compliance with the regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been completed and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been issued. The EA authorizes land use for six Bakken and Three Forks oil and gas wells located on two well pads on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation.

All the necessary requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act have been completed. Attached for your files is a copy of the EA, FONSI and Notice of Availability. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations require that there be a public notice of availability of the (40 C.F.R. Section 1506.6(b)). Please post the attached notice of availability at the Agency and Tribal buildings for 30 days.

If you have any questions, please call Marilyn Bercier, Regional Environmental Scientist, Division of Environment, Safety and Cultural Resources Management, at (605) 226-7656.

Attachment

cc: Tex Hall, Chairman, Three Affiliated Tribes (with attachment)
Elgin Crows Breast, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (with attachment)
Derek Enderud, BLM, Bureau of Land Management (with attachment)
Laura Burckhardt/Kimerly Ip, SWCA (with attachment)
Eric Wortman, EPA (with attachment)
Carson Hood/Fred Fox, MHA Energy Dept. (with attachment)
Jonathon Shelman, Corps of Engineers (e-mail)
Jeff Hunt, Fort Berthold Agency (e-mail)



Finding of No Significant Impact

Enerplus Resources

Environmental Assessment

***Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads:
Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF
Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and
Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF***

***Fort Berthold Indian Reservation
McKenzie County, North Dakota***

The U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) has received a proposal to authorize land use for Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF on the Fort Berthold Reservation.

One well pad would be located approximately 11.7 miles east of Keene in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 19, Township (T) 152 North (N), Range (R) 94 West (W), McKenzie County, North Dakota, within a 640-acre spacing unit. This location would contain the following wells:

- Racer #152-94-19B
- Garter #152-94-19BH TF

A second well pad would be located approximately 8.3 miles southwest of Mandaree in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 36, T149N, R95W, McKenzie County, North Dakota, within two 1,280-acre spacing units. This location would contain the following wells:

- Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H
- Rod #149-95-36D-25H
- Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF
- Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF

Associated federal actions by BIA include determinations of impacts and effects regarding environmental resources for developments on tribal lands.


The potential of the proposed actions to impact the human environment is analyzed in the attached addendum to an existing EA, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. Based on the recently completed addendum to the EA, I have determined that the proposed project will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. No Environmental Impact Statement is required for any portion of the proposed activities.

This determination is based on the following factors:

1. Agency and public involvement solicited for the preceding NEPA document was sufficient to ascertain potential environmental concerns associated with the currently proposed project.
2. Protective and prudent measures were designed to minimize impacts to air, water, soil, vegetation, wetlands, wildlife, public safety, water resources, and cultural resources. The remaining potential for impacts was disclosed for both the proposed actions and the No Action alternative.
3. Guidance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been fully considered regarding wildlife impacts, particularly in regard to threatened or endangered species. This guidance includes the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668-668d, 54

Stat. 250), Executive Order 13186 "Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds", and the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

4. The proposed actions are designed to avoid adverse effects to historic, archaeological, cultural and traditional properties, sites and practices. Compliance with the procedures of the National Historic Preservation Act is complete.
5. Environmental justice was fully considered.
6. Cumulative effects to the environment are either mitigated or minimal.
7. No regulatory requirements have been waived or require compensatory mitigation measures.
8. The proposed projects will improve the socio-economic condition of the affected Indian community.



Regional Director

9/12/12

Date

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Indian Affairs**

**Great Plains Regional Office
Aberdeen, South Dakota**

**Cooperating Agency:
Bureau of Land Management
North Dakota Field Office
Dickinson, North Dakota**



Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation

Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads:

**Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF
Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel
#149-95-36D-25H TF**

Fort Berthold Indian Reservation

September 2012

For information contact:
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Great Plains Regional Office
Division of Environment, Safety and Cultural Resources Management
115 4th Avenue SE, Aberdeen, South Dakota 57401
(605) 226-7656

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2 Federal and Other Relevant Regulations and Authorities | 6 |
| 2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE | 8 |
| 2.1 The No Action Alternative | 8 |
| 2.2 The Proposed Action | 8 |
| 2.2.1 Well Pad and Infrastructure Locations and Disturbance..... | 8 |
| 2.2.2 Well Pads | 10 |
| 2.2.3 Access Roads and Utility Corridors..... | 11 |
| 2.2.4 Drilling..... | 11 |
| 2.2.5 Casing and Cementing | 13 |
| 2.2.6 Completion and Evaluation..... | 13 |
| 2.2.7 Commercial Production | 14 |
| 2.2.8 Gathering Pipelines | 14 |
| 2.2.9 Field Camp..... | 16 |
| 2.2.10 Construction Details at Individual Sites..... | 16 |
| 2.2.11 Reclamation..... | 18 |
| 2.3 BIA-Preferred Alternative..... | 20 |
| 3.0 THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS | 21 |
| 3.1 Physical and Geological Setting..... | 21 |
| 3.2 Air Quality..... | 23 |
| 3.2.1 Air Quality Standards and Criteria Pollutants..... | 23 |
| 3.2.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change | 26 |
| 3.2.3 Hazardous Air Pollutants | 29 |
| 3.2.4 Existing Air Quality in the Project Area | 29 |
| 3.2.5 Typical Project Emissions from Oilfield Development..... | 31 |
| 3.2.6 Air Quality Best Management Practices | 31 |
| 3.2.7 Potential Air Quality Impacts..... | 32 |
| 3.3 Water Resources..... | 32 |
| 3.3.1 Surface Water..... | 32 |
| 3.3.2 Groundwater..... | 37 |
| 3.3.3 Potential Impacts to Surface Water and Groundwater Resources | 40 |
| 3.4 Soils..... | 42 |
| 3.4.1 Hills and Ridges | 42 |
| 3.4.2 Plains and Rises | 44 |
| 3.4.3 Project-Specific Surface Disturbance | 44 |
| 3.4.4 Field Descriptions | 47 |
| 3.4.5 Potential Impacts from Soil Erosion | 47 |
| 3.4.6 Erosion Control Measures..... | 48 |
| 3.5 Wetlands..... | 50 |
| 3.5.1 Potential Impacts on Wetlands..... | 50 |
| 3.6 Vegetation and Invasive Species | 55 |
| 3.6.1 Vegetation Data..... | 55 |
| 3.6.2 Threatened and Endangered Plant Species | 57 |
| 3.6.3 Noxious Weeds | 57 |

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| 3.6.4 | Potential Impacts on Vegetation and Noxious Weeds | 58 |
| 3.7 | Wildlife and Habitat | 59 |
| 3.7.1 | General Wildlife Species Occurrence and Habitat..... | 60 |
| 3.7.2 | Threatened and Endangered Species Occurrence and Habitat..... | 60 |
| 3.7.3 | Potential Impacts to Wildlife | 61 |
| 3.8 | Cultural Resources | 68 |
| 3.8.1 | Cultural Resource Inventories..... | 68 |
| 3.8.2 | Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources | 69 |
| 3.9 | TRANSPORTATION | 69 |
| 3.9.1 | Federal and North Dakota State Transportation Links | 69 |
| 3.9.2 | Indian Reservation Roads Program..... | 72 |
| 3.9.3 | Trends in Reservation Vehicular Traffic Volume..... | 72 |
| 3.9.4 | Trends in Traffic Safety on the Reservation | 74 |
| 3.9.5 | Potential Impacts to Transportation | 78 |
| 3.10 | Public Health and Safety | 78 |
| 3.10.1 | Potential Impacts to Public Health and Safety..... | 79 |
| 3.11 | Socioeconomics..... | 80 |
| 3.11.1 | Socioeconomic Analysis Area | 80 |
| 3.11.2 | Population and Demographic Trends..... | 80 |
| 3.11.3 | Employment | 81 |
| 3.11.4 | Income..... | 82 |
| 3.11.5 | Housing | 83 |
| 3.11.6 | Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics | 85 |
| 3.12 | Environmental Justice | 87 |
| 3.12.1 | Potential Impacts to Environmental Justice..... | 89 |
| 3.13 | Mitigation and Monitoring | 90 |
| 3.13.1 | General BMPs | 91 |
| 3.13.2 | Mitigation and Safety Measures Committed to by Enerplus | 92 |
| 3.14 | Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources | 95 |
| 3.15 | Short-Term Use versus Long-Term Productivity..... | 96 |
| 3.16 | Cumulative Impacts..... | 96 |
| 3.16.1 | Cumulative Effects on Public Health and Safety..... | 99 |
| 3.16.2 | Cumulative Effects on Air Quality | 99 |
| 3.16.3 | Cumulative Effects on Water Resources..... | 99 |
| 3.16.4 | Cumulative Effects on Soils..... | 100 |
| 3.16.5 | Cumulative Effects on Wetlands..... | 100 |
| 3.16.6 | Cumulative Effects on Vegetation and Invasive Species..... | 100 |
| 3.16.7 | Cumulative Effects on Wildlife and Habitat..... | 101 |
| 3.16.8 | Cumulative Effects on Cultural Resources | 101 |
| 3.16.9 | Cumulative Effects on Transportation | 101 |
| 3.16.10 | Cumulative Effects on Socioeconomics..... | 102 |
| 4.0 | CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION | 103 |
| 5.0 | LIST OF PREPARERS..... | 109 |
| 6.0 | REFERENCES..... | 110 |
| 7.0 | ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS | 116 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.1 Project location for the proposed wells in the NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W. | 2 |
| 1.2 Project location for the proposed wells in the NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W. | 3 |
| 1.3 640-acre spacing unit for the proposed wells located in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, and their respective drilling targets. | 4 |
| 1.4 Two 1,280-acre spacing units for the proposed wells located in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, and their respective drilling targets. | 5 |
| 2.1 Typical road cross sections (BLM and USFS 2007). | 12 |
| 2.2 Typical drilling rig. | 13 |
| 2.3 Example of reclamation from the BLM Gold Book (BLM and USFS 2007). | 19 |
| 3.1 Typical stratigraphic column of the Williston Basin, with oil and gas bearing formations (Source: Peterson 1995). | 22 |
| 3.2 Temperature anomalies in the contiguous United States, 1979–2009. | 28 |
| 3.3 Watersheds, aquifers, and existing water wells near the project areas (North Dakota Department of Health, Division of Water Quality 2011). | 34 |
| 3.4 Surface runoff and drainage direction from the proposed well pad in Section 19, T152N, R94W. | 35 |
| 3.5 Surface runoff and drainage direction from the proposed well pad in Section 36, T149N, R95W. | 36 |
| 3.6 Approximate spatial extent of soil components within and around the project area located in Section 19, T152N, R94W. | 45 |
| 3.7 Approximate spatial extent of soil components within and around the project area located in Section 36, T149N, R95W. | 46 |
| 3.8 NWI-identified wetlands within 0.5 mile of the proposed project area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W. | 53 |
| 3.9 NWI-identified wetlands within 0.5 mile of the proposed project area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W. | 54 |
| 3.10 Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, facing northeast. Photo taken May 7, 2012. | 55 |
| 3.11 Vegetation in the access road area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, facing north. Photo taken May 7, 2012. | 56 |
| 3.12 Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, facing east. Photo taken June 11, 2012. | 57 |
| 3.13 Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, facing west. Photo taken June 11, 2012. | 57 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

| Figure | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 3.14 Fort Berthold Indian Reservation major roads and highways. | 71 |
| 3.15 Active, confidential, and permitted wells within a 1-, 5-, 10-, and 20-mile radius of the proposed project locations. | 98 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| 2.1 Proposed Well Pad and Infrastructure Locations, Disturbance, and Site-specific Owner-committed Measures. | 9 |
| 3.1 NAAQS and Other Air Quality Standards. | 26 |
| 3.2 Maximum Levels of Monitored Pollutants, 2007–2010, as Measured at Dunn Center and Theodore Roosevelt National Park North Unit Monitoring Stations. | 30 |
| 3.3 Common Aquifers in the Proposed Project Area and Surrounding Region. | 38 |
| 3.4 Common Additives of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid. | 39 |
| 3.5 Soil Groups within the Project Area. | 43 |
| 3.6 Percentage of the Project Area Disturbance Comprised of Specific Soil Components. | 44 |
| 3.7 Soil Data Obtained through the Excavation of Soil Pits within the Proposed Project Area. | 47 |
| 3.8 Wetland Types within 0.5 Mile of the Project Area. | 52 |
| 3.9 Recognized Noxious Weed Occupied Areas in McKenzie County, North Dakota. | 58 |
| 3.10 Summary of Potential Effects to Threatened and Endangered Species. | 62 |
| 3.11 Summary of BIA Roads with ADT Data since 1994. | 73 |
| 3.12 Changes in ADT along NDDOT Highways within the Reservation, 2005–2010. | 75 |
| 3.13 41-month Safety Trends on NDDOT Roads within the Reservation. | 76 |
| 3.14 Population and Demographic Trends in the Analysis Area. | 81 |
| 3.15 2010 Total Employment and Unemployment Rates. | 82 |
| 3.16 Income and Poverty in Analysis Area. | 83 |
| 3.17 Housing Data for the Reservation and Study Area Counties. | 84 |
| 3.18 Housing Development Data for the Encompassing Counties, 2000–2008. | 85 |
| 3.19 Duration of Employment during Proposed Project Implementation. | 86 |
| 3.20 Minority Population Breakdown by North Dakota County and Race, 2000–2010. | 88 |
| 3.21 Individual Poverty Rates and Median Household Income for the Analysis Area. | 89 |
| 3.22 Active, Confidential, and Permitted Wells within the Cumulative Impact Analysis Area. | 97 |
| 4.1 Scoping Comments. | 104 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

- A Threatened and Endangered Species in McKenzie County
- B Natural Resources Soil Descriptions and Attributes
- C Consultations and Responses

1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation (Enerplus) has acquired the leases and is proposing to drill six horizontal oil and gas wells on two pad locations on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation (Reservation) to evaluate, and possibly develop, the commercial potential of these natural resources. Developments have been proposed on lands held in trust by the United States in McKenzie County, North Dakota. The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is the surface management agency for potentially affected tribal lands and individual allotments. The BIA manages lands held in title by the tribe and tribal members and subsurface mineral rights. Development has been proposed for six exploratory wells that target specific areas in the Bakken and Three Forks geological formations, which are known to contain hydrocarbon reserves. The two well pads are located within the boundaries of the Reservation. The project areas are illustrated in Figures 1.1 and 1.2.

One well pad would be located approximately 11.7 miles east of Keene in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 19, Township (T) 152 North (N), Range (R) 94 West (W), McKenzie County, North Dakota, within a 640-acre spacing unit (Figures 1.1 and 1.3). This location would contain the following wells:

- Racer #152-94-19B
- Garter #152-94-19BH TF

A second well pad would be located approximately 8.3 miles southwest of Mandaree in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 36, T149N, R95W, McKenzie County, North Dakota, within two 1,280-acre spacing units (Figures 1.2 and 1.4). This location would contain the following wells:

- Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H
- Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF
- Rod #149-95-36D-25H
- Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF

The new access roads with underground utility corridors to each well pad, located on allotted lands (Figures 1.1 and 1.2), would be constructed to facilitate the construction and operation of each proposed well pad. Well pads would be designed and constructed to accommodate drilling activities and well operations. All containment pits constructed for dry drill cuttings that are used during drilling operations would be reclaimed once drilling operations have ceased.




Figure 1.1. Project location for the proposed wells in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 19, T152N, R94W.




Figure 1.2. Project location for the proposed wells in the NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W.




Figure 1.3. 640-acre spacing unit for the proposed wells located in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, and their respective drilling targets.




Figure 1.4. Two 1,280-acre spacing units for the proposed wells located in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, and their respective drilling targets.

Proposed well sites would also include support infrastructure or facilities; buried gathering oil, gas, and produced water pipelines; radio towers; and underground electrical and fiber optic utilities if the wells are economically feasible and completed for long-term commercial production. All surface disturbances and well site components (i.e., roads, well pads, supporting facilities) would be reclaimed upon final abandonment unless formally transferred, with federal approval, to either the BIA or the landowner. The proposed wells are exploratory; should they prove economically feasible for commercial production, further exploration of surrounding areas is possible.

This environmental assessment (EA) addresses the potential impacts associated with the construction, and possible long-term operation, of the above-listed wells and directly related infrastructure and facilities. Further oil and gas exploration and development would require additional analysis and federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended.

1.2 FEDERAL AND OTHER RELEVANT REGULATIONS AND AUTHORITIES

The BIA's general mission is to represent the interests, including the trust resources, of members of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara (MHA) Nation, as well as those of individual tribal members. All members of the MHA Nation, including individual allotment owners, would benefit substantially from the development of oil and gas exploration on the Reservation. Oil and gas exploration and subsequent development are under the authority of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 United States Code [USC] 15801, et seq.), the Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 USC 1701, et seq.), the Indian Mineral Development Act of 1982 (25 USC 2101, et seq.), and the Indian Mineral Leasing Act of 1938 (25 USC 396a, et seq.). The BIA's role in the proposed project includes approving easements, leases, and rights-of-way (ROWs) for the well pads, access roads, and gathering pipelines; determining effects on cultural resources; and making recommendations to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

Compliance with the NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500–1508), 43 CFR 3100, and Onshore Oil and Gas Order Nos. 1, 2, 6, and 7 is required due to the project's location on tribal lands. The BLM is responsible for the final approval of all Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) after receiving recommendations from the BIA. The BLM, in coordination with the BIA, is also tasked with on-site monitoring of construction and production activities, as well as resolution of any dispute that may arise as a result of any of the aforementioned actions.

The procedures and technical practices presented in the APD supporting documents and in the EA describe potential impacts to the project area. This EA analyzes potential impacts to elements in the natural and human environments for both the No Action Alternative (described in Section 2.1) and the Proposed Action. Impacts may be beneficial or detrimental, direct or indirect, and short-term or long-term. The EA also analyzes the potential for cumulative impacts and ultimately makes a determination as to the significance of any impacts.

In the absence of significant negative consequences, the EA would result in a Finding of No Significant Impact. Should significant adverse impacts be identified as a result of the direct, indirect, or cumulative effects of the Proposed Action, then the NEPA requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement. Commercial viability of the proposed wells could result in additional exploration in the area, and any future oil/gas exploration activities and associated federal actions that are proposed wholly or partly on trust lands would require additional NEPA analysis and BIA consideration prior to implementation and/or production activities.

If a positive determination is made and a Notice to Proceed with the proposed project is issued, Enerplus would comply with all applicable federal, state, and tribal laws, rules, policies, regulations, and agreements. Enerplus also agrees to follow all best management practices (BMPs) and monitoring mitigations listed in this document. No disturbances of any kind can begin until all required clearances, consultations, determinations, easements, leases, resource surveys, and applicable permits are in place.

2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

The BIA, as required by the NEPA, must “study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to the recommended course of action in any proposal that involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources” (NEPA Sec. 102[2][e]). Developing a range of alternatives allows for exploration of options designed to meet the purpose and need for the action. Along with the No Action Alternative, the BIA is considering the Proposed Action.

2.1 THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed project, including well pads, wells, access roads, and underground utility lines, would not be constructed, drilled, installed, or operated. The BIA would not approve easements, leases, or ROWs for the proposed locations and the BLM would not approve the APDs. No adverse impacts would occur as a result of this alternative to the following critical elements: air quality, public health and safety, water resources, wetland/riparian habitat, threatened and endangered species, soils, vegetation and invasive species, cultural resources, socioeconomic conditions, transportation, and environmental justice (EJ). There would be no project-related ground disturbance, use of hazardous materials, or trucking of products to collection areas. Surface disturbance, deposition of potentially harmful biological material, and traffic levels would not change from present levels. Under the No Action Alternative, the MHA Nation, tribal members, and allottees would not have the opportunity to realize potential financial gains resulting from the potential discovery of hydrocarbon resources at these well locations.

2.2 THE PROPOSED ACTION

In addition to the No Action Alternative, this document analyzes the potential impacts of six exploratory oil and gas wells on two pad locations with varied surface and mineral estates located in the southwest portion of the Reservation in McKenzie County. The proposed wells would test the commercial potential of the Bakken and Three Forks formations in these specific spacing units. Well bottom hole locations, shown in Figures 1.3 and 1.4, were chosen by Enerplus in consultation with tribal and BIA resource managers.

2.2.1 Well Pad and Infrastructure Locations and Disturbance

Well pad and infrastructure locations, shown in Figures 1.1 and 1.2 and detailed in Table 2.1, were developed in consultation with tribal and BIA resource managers during a pre-clearance process that included surveys for cultural, archaeological, and natural (i.e., biological and physical) resources. Short-term construction disturbance at the well pads would consist of all areas within the fenced perimeter around the well pad cut and fill areas, and the access roads and utility corridors. Long-term disturbance would consist of the un-reclaimed well pad areas and access roads.

Table 2.1. Proposed Well Pad and Infrastructure Locations, Disturbance, and Site-specific Owner-committed Measures.

| Well Pad Location | Well Name | Short-term Disturbance | Long-term Disturbance | Site-specific Owner-committed Measures |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, Township (T) 152 North (N), Range (R) 94 West (W), McKenzie County, North Dakota | Racer #152-94-19B Garter #152-94-19BH TF | Well pad construction area of 9.66 ¹ acres. 475-foot-long (0.60 ² -acre) access road and utility corridor. | 3.32-acre un-reclaimed well pad construction area. 0.72 ³ -acre un-reclaimed access road. | Install access road signage on State Highway 23 to alert drivers to traffic coming from the proposed access road. Use semi-closed-loop drilling system. Construct an 18-inch-tall berm on the west side of the well pad. Install matting and straw rolls on exposed slopes to inhibit erosion. Implement noxious weed control due to the presence of Canada thistle (<i>Cirsium arvense</i>) on the well pad. Round corners of well pad as needed. |
| NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, McKenzie County, North Dakota | Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF Rod #149-95-36D-25H Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF | Well pad construction area of 9.50 ¹ acres. 226-foot-long (0.08 ² -acre) access road and utility corridor. | 3.94-acre un-reclaimed well pad construction area. 0.34 ³ -acre un-reclaimed access road. | Use semi-closed-loop drilling system. Construct an 18-inch-tall berm around the well pad. Install matting and straw rolls on exposed slopes to inhibit erosion. Round corners of well pad as needed. |
| Total Disturbance | | 19.84 acres | 8.32 acres | |

¹ Well pad construction area acres of disturbance include the well pad, and access road and utility corridor within the fenced well pad perimeter.

² Access road disturbance acreage only includes the road located outside of the fenced well pad perimeter.

³ Un-reclaimed access road, within and outside of the fenced well pad perimeter, acreage based on maximum of a 66-foot road base.

Natural and cultural resource surveys were performed by SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) on September 28, 2011, and May 7 and June 11, 2012, at the proposed project areas to assess potential impacts to resources. Interdisciplinary on-site meetings were conducted on May 15 and June 11, 2012, to review the results of the resource surveys of the well pad locations, proposed access roads, and underground utility corridors. The on-site meetings were attended by the civil surveyor, the SWCA representative, the Enerplus representative, and the BIA representative. Site topography, potential drainage issues, and erosion control measures associated with well pad and road placement were discussed during the on-site meetings. Related facility locations (access roads, gathering pipelines, topsoil/subsoil stockpiles, tanks, etc.) were also discussed in order to minimize effects to natural and cultural resources.

After securing mineral leases, ROW on-site meetings were conducted with the BLM on June 13 and July 2, 2012. Copies of APDs submitted to the BLM North Dakota Field Office were submitted to the BIA's office in New Town, North Dakota. Construction would begin only when the BIA completes the NEPA process and the APDs are subsequently approved by the BLM.

The combined short-term construction disturbance of the project is estimated to total approximately 19.84 acres. Approximately 19.16 acres, consisting of the constructed well pads and portions of the access roads and utility corridors, would be located within fenced perimeters. The remaining 0.68 acre would be required to construct the access roads and underground utility corridors outside of the fenced perimeters. After well completion, all areas not needed for production operations would be reclaimed during interim reclamations. The un-reclaimed area is considered long-term surface disturbance and would total approximately 8.32 acres, comprised of 7.26 acres associated with the well pads and 1.06 acres associated with the access roads. Other site-specific measures were identified during the interdisciplinary site assessments and are required by BIA. These measures are identified in Table 2.1 and incorporated into the project's final designs and operator-committed measures.

2.2.2 Well Pads

Two new well pads are proposed, with two to four wells per pad. Perimeter fences, approximately 600 feet wide and 750 to 800 feet long, would be constructed to surround the pads. The pads would be used to support the drilling rig and equipment and a temporary lined cuttings pit would be excavated and used for dry drilling cuttings. The pads would be initially stripped of topsoil and vegetation and then graded to form a level pad surface. The topsoil would be stockpiled immediately adjacent to the leveled pad and stabilized with a cover crop until it could be used in interim and final reclamation. The subsoils would be used in the construction of the pads and the finished pads would be graded to ensure that water drains away from the pads. Erosion-control BMPs would be implemented and could include surface drainage controls, soil surface protection methodologies, and sediment capture features.

Cut-and-fill slopes, stockpiled topsoil, and cuttings pit backfill placed on the edge of the pads would result in some additional surface disturbance per pad. Total long-term surface disturbance not included in interim reclamation along the well pads within the fenced perimeter would total approximately 7.26 acres (Table 2.1). All proposed pads would have

contoured slopes on both the cut and fill ends. Details of pad construction and reclamation can be found in the APDs.

2.2.3 Access Roads and Utility Corridors

New access roads are proposed for all locations. The access road for the well pad located in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, would extend approximately 475 feet south from State Highway 23. The access road for the well pad located in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, would extend approximately 226 feet north from BIA Road 30. In total, 701 feet (0.13 mile) of new access roads would be constructed. A maximum disturbed ROW width of 66 feet would be used for the access roads and utility corridors. Approximately 1.06 acres of new short-term surface disturbance would result from the proposed roads and utility corridors, both within (0.38 acre) and outside (0.68 acre) the fenced perimeters surrounding the well pads. Unused ROW would be reclaimed and a maximum long-term disturbance of approximately 1.06 acres would result from the proposed roads, which would not exceed a maximum width of 66 feet. All proposed access roads would have cattle guards installed at the entrance to access spurs and pads. Signed agreements would be in place allowing road construction across affected private and allotted land surfaces, and any applicable approach permits and/or easements would be obtained prior to any construction activity.

Construction would follow road design standards outlined in the BLM Gold Book (BLM and U.S. Forest Service [USFS] 2007). At a minimum, 6 inches of topsoil would be removed from the access road corridors. This stockpiled topsoil would then be placed on the outside slopes of the ditches following road construction. The ditches would be seeded as quickly as possible using a seed mixture determined by the BIA. Care would be taken during road construction to avoid disturbing or disrupting any buried utilities that may exist along established roads, or in the vicinity of new road construction. The access roads would be surfaced with a minimum of 4 inches of aggregate prior to commencement of drilling operations and would remain in use for the life of the wells. Details of road construction are addressed in the APDs. A diagram of typical road cross sections is provided as Figure 2.1.

2.2.4 Drilling

Enerplus would use semi-closed-loop drilling systems with dry cuttings pits for the drilling of the wells. Cuttings would be contained and solidified with fly ash, placed in the pit, and buried in place following completion of drilling operations, as described in Section 2.2.11.1. In some cases, Enerplus would bury only surface cuttings (approximately 2,500 feet of the vertical hole) that are drilled using freshwater. The surface cuttings pit would be closed before drilling operations begin using invert mud. All other drilling fluids and cuttings following the drilling of the surface section would be contained in tanks and disposed of at approved locations.




Figure 2.1. Typical road cross sections (BLM and USFS 2007).

Rig transport and on-site assembly would take approximately 7 days for each well; a typical drill rig is shown in Figure 2.2. Drilling would require approximately 30 days to reach target depth, using a rotary drilling rig rated for drilling to approximately 20,000 feet. For the first 2,000 feet drilled, a freshwater-based mud system (1.26 gallons per foot of hole drilled) with non-hazardous additives would be used to minimize contaminant concerns. Water would be obtained from a commercial source for this drilling stage.



Figure 2.2. Typical drilling rig.

After setting and cementing the near-surface casing, an oil-based mud system (80% to 85% diesel fuel and 15% to 20% water) would be used to drill to a 7-inch casing point at approximately 11,100 feet, depending on the formation targeted. Oil-based drilling fluids reduce the potential for hole sloughing while drilling through water-sensitive formations (shales/salts). Approximately 3,400 gallons of salt water and 13,400 gallons of diesel fuel per well would be used to complete vertical drilling. The lateral or horizontal reach of the borehole would be drilled using approximately 63,000 gallons of salt water as mud and adding polymer sweep as necessary to clean the bore hole. With the semi-closed-loop system, the drilling fluids used following drilling of the surface section would be contained in tanks and disposed of at approved locations. Only dry cuttings would be buried in the pit as per North Dakota Industrial Commission (NDIC) regulations.

2.2.5 Casing and Cementing

Surface casing would be set at an approximate depth of 2,200 to 2,400 feet, depending on the targeted formation, and cemented back to the surface during drilling, isolating all near-surface freshwater aquifers in the project area. The Fox Hills Formation and Pierre Formation, associated with localized aquifers, would be encountered at depths of approximately 1,600 to 2,200 feet. Intermediate casing would be cemented from approximately 11,100 feet (total measured depth [TMD]) deep to a depth of about 4,700 to 4,800 feet in order to isolate the hydrocarbon zone present in the Dakota Formation. Casing and cementing operations would be conducted in full compliance with Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 2 (43 CFR 3160).

2.2.6 Completion and Evaluation

A completion rig would be moved on site following the conclusion of drilling and casing activities. Approximately 30 days are usually required, at the proposed well depths, to clean

out the well bore, pressure test the casing, perforate and fracture the horizontal portion of the bore hole, and run production tubing for commercial production. The typical procedure for fracturing a target formation to increase production includes pumping a mixture of sand and a carrier (e.g., water and/or nitrogen) downhole under extreme pressure. The resulting fractures are propped open by the sand, increasing the capture zone of the well and subsequently maximizing the efficient drainage of the field. After fracturing, the well is “flowed back” to the surface where hydraulic fracturing (HF) fluids are recovered and disposed of in accordance with NDIC rules and regulations.

2.2.7 Commercial Production

If drilling, testing, and completion support commercial production from any of the proposed locations, additional equipment would be installed, including a pumping unit at the well head, a vertical heater/treater, tanks (usually 400-barrel steel tanks), and a flare pit. A radio tower would be installed at the well pad locations to allow for remote monitoring of facilities. The radio tower would be constructed to a height ranging between 20 to 50 feet.

At all locations, a 3-foot-high 12-gauge steel containment with a 24-millimeter load out liner and concrete footer would be installed under and around all tank batteries and treater/separator. A heavy screen-covered drip barrel would be installed under the outlet. A metal access staircase would protect the dike and support flexible hoses used by tanker trucks. This system is designed to hold 110% of the capacity of the largest tank plus one day’s production to prevent hazardous runoff or spills. For all aboveground facilities not subject to safety requirements, the BIA would choose a paint color, recommended by the BLM or the Rocky Mountain Five-State Interagency Committee, which would blend with the natural color of the landscape.

Oil would initially be collected in tanks installed on location and periodically trucked to an existing oil terminal for sales. Any produced water would be captured in tanks and periodically trucked to an approved disposal site. The frequency of trucking activities for both oil and produced water would depend upon volumes and rates of production. Once gathering lines are installed, trucking would no longer occur. The duration of production operations cannot be reliably predicted, but some oil wells have pumped for more than 100 years. The operator estimates that each well would yield approximately 180 barrels of oil per day and 40 barrels of water during the first year of production. After the first year, the operator estimates production would decrease to approximately 40 to 60 barrels of oil per day and 10 to 15 barrels of water. Produced water is mostly recovered HF fluids and is expected to become minimal after 2 years.

Large volumes of gas are not expected from these locations. Until gathering pipelines are installed, small volumes would be flared in accordance with Notice to Lessees 4A and adopted NDIC regulations, which prohibit unrestricted flaring for more than the initial year of operation (North Dakota Century Code 38-08-06.4).

2.2.8 Gathering Pipelines

In the future, the operator may install a full utility corridor within the access road ROW. If the utility corridor is outside of the approved access road ROW, then additional NEPA analysis

will be needed. The utility corridor is sized to accommodate the installation of buried oil, gas, and produced water gathering pipelines and buried electric and fiber optic lines. Gathering pipelines would tie into main pipeline trunk lines.

Gathering pipelines consist of oil, gas, and produced water pipelines and are designed and sized to prevent erosion—which is an internal pipe condition caused by excessive abrasion of fine particles in the pipeline system or by excessive velocity of the transported product—by a safety factor of approximately two. Based on these criteria, the oil and gas pipelines would be constructed with new steel and would be 12 inches or less in diameter and the produced water pipelines would be constructed with Fiberspar[®] and would be 6 inches or less in diameter. The gathering pipelines would be coated with between 14 and 16 millimeters of fusion bonded epoxy, which helps protect the pipelines against corrosive elements in the soil. Field joints are also protected by shrink sleeves. Specialty coatings are also used, as applicable, for underground fittings and bore crossings, to provide additional levels of protection from leakage or corrosion. The coating and shrink sleeves are inspected thoroughly at the time of installation, both visually and electronically. All pipelines are clearly marked following the U.S. Department of Transportation's rules and regulations, 49 CFR Parts 192 and 195. To prevent potential erosion or rupturing of the pipeline within critical areas near Lake Sakakawea or in drainages, the type, placement, and depth of gathering pipelines is designed based on soil types, localized topography, and the catchment size of drainages. Gathering pipelines would be placed a minimum of 8 feet below the substrate surface of drainages and pipes would be coated with specialty abrasion-resistant coating that provides additional protection from large-scale erosion or flooding events. Pipelines are also equipped with check valves and manual valves between the trunk line and gathering pipeline, or lateral line, which provide connections to help limit the volume of potential spills.

After installation, the pipelines will be cleaned and inspected via internal tools (e.g., cleaning pigs and smart pigs), which help to identify integrity issues in the pipes. Hydrostatic testing is conducted to ensure that there is no leakage of the pipe. A cathodic survey using test stations, rectifier pads, and other means designed by cathodic protection specialists is also conducted. Any stress or damage issues identified in the pipelines can be quickly identified and remedied prior to backfill. Throughout the life of the gathering pipelines, an appropriate amount of cathodic active current is placed on pipeline segments and monitored in accordance with the strict pipeline safety requirements set forth in the U.S. Department of Transportation's rules and regulations. In order to assure the quality of the installation and the effectiveness of its corrosion control systems, pig launchers and receivers are also installed on the trunk lines and primary laterals to identify pipeline conditions both internally and externally, in order to maintain the integrity.

Saddle Butte Pipeline, LLC, (SBP) is one of two midstream companies currently building a pipeline infrastructure on the Reservation. SBP is the main pipeline trunk line that the proposed wells would tie into. SBP has developed a Spill Response Plan (Plan) for its pipeline construction and operation activities which includes spill preventative measures and monitoring protocols, notification procedures, spill detection and on-scene spill mitigation procedures, response activities, contacts, training and drill procedures, and response plan review and update procedures. SBP is committed to adhering to the Plan as well as the procedures and requirements set forth by federal law (49 CFR Part 194). SBP has also

committed to providing the site-specific spill response plan to the BIA prior to the commencement of construction activities.

2.2.9 Field Camp

A few personnel would be housed in self-contained trailers for a very short period of time; long-term housing is not proposed. Most personnel, both construction and drilling, would commute to the site. Human waste would be collected on site in portable toilets and trailers and it would be transported off site to a state-approved wastewater treatment facility. All other solid waste would be contained in enclosed containers and transported to, and disposed of at, state-approved facilities.

2.2.10 Construction Details at Individual Sites

2.2.10.1 Well Pad in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W

This proposed well location, illustrated in Figure 1.1, is located 11.7 miles east of Keene, North Dakota. A new access road/utility corridor, approximately 475 feet in length, would be constructed to connect the proposed Enerplus pad to State Highway 23 (Figure 1.1). The new access road would have a ROW width of 66 feet, and would disturb approximately 0.72 acre both within and outside of the perimeter fence. The proposed well pad construction area (which includes part of the acreage for the access road/utility corridor) would initially disturb approximately 9.66 acres within the perimeter fence, bringing the total anticipated new disturbance to 10.26 acres. Long-term disturbance associated with this location would be 4.04 acres total, including 3.32 acres of un-reclaimed well pad and 0.72 acre of un-reclaimed access road. Two wells would be drilled on this well pad.

Please see Section 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring, for information regarding general BMPs and other protection measures. In addition, the BIA would require, and Enerplus has committed to use, the site-specific protection measures at this well pad site, identified in Table 2.1, which would reduce effects to various environmental resources.

2.2.10.1.1 *Racer #152-94-19B*

The spacing unit consists of 640 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the SE¼ SW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W (Figure 1.3). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,025 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate total vertical depth (TVD) of 10,775 feet. The drill string would total approximately 15,875 feet at TMD, including approximately 5,100 feet of lateral reach into the Middle Bakken member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the south section line and 1,980 feet from the west line, about 4,601 feet south and 368 feet east of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.10.1.2 *Garter #152-94-19BH TF*

The spacing unit consists of 640 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the SW¼ SW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W (Figure 1.3). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,085 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate TVD of 10,835 feet. The drill string would total approximately 15,935 feet at TMD, including approximately 5,100 feet of lateral reach into the Three Forks member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the south section line and 550 feet from the

west line, about 4,596 feet south and 962 feet west of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.10.2 Well Pad in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W

This proposed well location, illustrated in Figure 1.2, is located approximately 8.3 miles southwest of Mandaree, North Dakota. A new access road/utility corridor, approximately 226 feet in length, would be constructed to connect the proposed Enerplus pad to BIA Road 30 (Figure 1.2). The new access road would have a ROW width of 66 feet, and would disturb approximately 0.34 acre both within and outside of the perimeter fence. The proposed well pad construction area (which includes part of the acreage for the access road/utility corridor) would initially disturb approximately 9.50 acres within the perimeter fence, bringing the total anticipated new disturbance to 9.58 acres. Long-term disturbance associated with this location would be 4.28 acres total, including 3.94 acres of un-reclaimed well pad and 0.34 acre of un-reclaimed access road. Four wells would be drilled on this well pad.

Please see Section 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring, for information regarding general BMPs and other protection measures. In addition, the BIA would require, and Enerplus has committed to use, the site-specific protection measures at this well pad site, identified in Table 2.1, which would reduce effects to various environmental resources.

2.2.10.2.1 Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H

The spacing unit consists of 1,280 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the SW¼ SW¼ Section 10, T148N, R95W (Figure 1.4). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,025 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate TVD of 10,775 feet. The drill string would total approximately 20,975 feet at TMD, including approximately 10,200 feet of lateral reach into the Middle Bakken member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the south section line and 550 feet from the west line, about 11,340 feet south and 705 feet west of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.10.2.2 Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF

The spacing unit consists of 1,280 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the SE¼ SW¼ Section 10, T148N, R95W (Figure 1.4). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,085 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate TVD of 10,835 feet. The drill string would total approximately 21,035 feet at TMD, including approximately 10,200 feet of lateral reach into the Three Forks member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the south section line and 1,980 feet from the west line, about 11,330 feet south and 677 feet east of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.10.2.3 Rod #149-95-36D-25H

The spacing unit consists of 1,280 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the NE¼ NE¼ Section 25, T149N, R95W (Figure 1.4). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,025 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate TVD of 10,775 feet. The drill string would total approximately 20,975 feet at TMD, including approximately 10,200 feet of lateral reach into the Middle Bakken member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the north section line and 550 feet

from the east line, about 8,942 feet north and 268 feet east of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.10.2.4 Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF

The spacing unit consists of 1,280 acres (+/-) with the bottom hole located in the NW¼ NE¼ Section 25, T149N, R95W (Figure 1.4). Vertical drilling to the kickoff point would be completed at approximately 10,085 feet, at which point drilling would turn roughly horizontal to an approximate TVD of 10,835 feet. The drill string would total approximately 21,035 feet at TMD, including approximately 10,200 feet of lateral reach into the Three Forks member. The drilling target is approximately 250 feet from the north section line and 1,940 feet from the east line, about 8,934 feet north and 1,073 feet east of the surface hole location. A setback of at least 200 feet would be maintained.

2.2.11 Reclamation

2.2.11.1 Interim Reclamation

Interim reclamation would consist of reclaiming all areas not needed for production operations for the life of a well. Immediately after well completion, all equipment and materials not necessary for production operations would be removed from a location and surrounding area. The dry cuttings pit contents would be treated, solidified, backfilled, and buried as soon as possible after well completion. Cuttings would be mixed with a non-toxic reagent resulting in an irreversible reaction to produce an inert, solid material. Any oil residue would be dispersed and captured, preventing coalescence and release to the environment at significant rates. The alkaline nature of the stabilized material also chemically stabilizes various metals that may be present, primarily by converting them into less soluble compounds. The treated material would then be buried in the cuttings pit, and overlain by at least 4 feet of overburden as required by adopted NDIC regulations. The surface above the cuttings pit would be seeded to re-establish native/desired vegetation. Topsoil would be spread along the cut and fill slopes of a road.


If commercial production equipment is installed, the well pads would be reduced in size by approximately 35%; the portion of the well pads not needed for production would be recontoured, covered with 6 inches of topsoil, and seeded using methods and seed mixtures determined by the BIA.

The working area of each well pad and the running surface of the access roads would be surfaced with scoria or crushed rock obtained from a previously approved location. The outslope portions of the roads would be covered with stockpiled topsoil and seeded with a seed mixture determined by the BIA, reducing the residual access-related disturbance to a width of approximately 28 feet. Enerplus would control noxious weeds within the ROW, well pads, or other applicable facilities by approved chemical or mechanical methods.


All topsoil material stockpiled after construction, and following interim reclamation, would be immediately placed in windrows no higher than 2 to 4 feet, seeded with a certified weed-free annual ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*) at a rate of 10 pounds per acre, and covered with fiber matting to prevent erosion and maintain soil fertility.

2.2.11.2 Final Reclamation

Final reclamation would occur either in the very short term if a proposed well is commercially unproductive, or later upon final abandonment of commercial operations. All disturbed areas would be reclaimed, reflecting the BIA view of oil and gas exploration and production as temporary intrusions on the landscape. All facilities would be removed, well bores would be plugged with cement, and dry hole markers would be set. Access roads and work areas would be leveled or backfilled as necessary, scarified, recontoured, and seeded. Exceptions to these reclamation measures might occur if the BIA approves assignment of an access road either to the BIA roads inventory or to concurring surface allottees. Figure 2.3 provides an example of reclamation (BLM and USFS 2007).



The well pad and access road are constructed to the minimum size necessary to safely conduct drilling and completion operations.



The well pad and access road have been recontoured back to the original contour, the topsoil respread, and the site revegetated.

Figure 2.3. Example of reclamation from the BLM Gold Book (BLM and USFS 2007).

2.3 BIA-PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The BIA-preferred alternative is to complete all administrative actions and approvals necessary to authorize or facilitate oil and gas developments at the proposed well pad locations.

3.0 THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The broad definition of NEPA leads to the consideration of the following elements of the human and natural environments: air quality, public health and safety, water resources, wetland/riparian habitat, threatened and endangered species, soils, vegetation and invasive species, cultural resources, socioeconomic conditions, transportation, and EJ.

3.1 PHYSICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The proposed well pads and spacing units are in a rural area located on the Reservation in west-central North Dakota. The Reservation is the home of the MHA Nation and encompasses more than one million acres, of which almost half, including the project area, are held in trust by the United States for either the MHA Nation or individual allottees.

The Reservation is within the northern Great Plains ecoregion, which consists of four physiographic units: 1) the Missouri Coteau Slope north of Lake Sakakawea, 2) the Missouri River trench (not flooded), 3) the Little Missouri River badlands, and 4) the Missouri Plateau south and west of Lake Sakakawea (Williams and Bluemle 1978). Much of the Reservation is on the Missouri Coteau Slope. Elevations of the glaciated, gently rolling landscape range from a normal pool elevation of 1,838 feet at Lake Sakakawea to over 2,600 feet on Phaelan's Butte near Mandaree. Annual precipitation on the plateau averages between 15 and 17 inches. Mean temperatures fluctuate between -3 and 21 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) in January and between 55°F and 83°F in July, with 95 to 130 frost-free days each year (Bryce et al. 1998; High Plains Regional Climate Center 2008).

The proposed well pads, access roads, and utility corridors are situated geologically within the Williston Basin, where the shallow structure consists of sandstones, silts, and shales dating to the Tertiary period (65 to 2 million years ago), including the Sentinel Butte and Golden Valley formations. The basin consists of deep layers of sedimentary rock deposited over time above a Precambrian geologic basement (Figure 3.1). Thick accumulations of limestone and dolomite were deposited during the Cambrian, Ordovician, Silurian, and Devonian periods, interspersed with thinner deposits of sandstone, siltstone, shales, and salts (Peterson 1995). Deposition has continued in the basin through the current geological epoch, with the maximum depth of sedimentary deposits of approximately 16,000 feet in the area of Williston, North Dakota (Peterson 1995).

The underlying Bakken and Three Forks formations are well-known sources of hydrocarbons within the Williston Basin. Although earlier oil/gas exploration activity within the Reservation was limited and commercially unproductive, recent economic changes and technological advances now make accessing oil in these formations more feasible.




Figure 3.1. Typical stratigraphic column of the Williston Basin, with oil and gas bearing formations (Source: Peterson 1995).

The proposed new exploratory wells would target the Bakken and Three Forks formations. The Bakken Formation was deposited during the Upper Devonian and Lower Mississippian periods, ranging from 417 to 350 million years ago. It lies approximately 11,000 feet below the surface at its deepest location, and approximately 8,500 feet beneath the Reservation where the new wells are proposed. The formation is typically 158 feet thick, made up of an upper and lower member composed of marine shales, with a middle member composed of thick interbedded layers of limestone, siltstone, dolomite, and sandstone. The Bakken Formation is located between thick and exceptionally tight formations of low-permeability carbonates: the Three Forks Limestone Formation lies below the Bakken Formation and is approximately 250 feet thick, while the Lodgepole Limestone lies above the Bakken Formation and is approximately 900 feet thick. These massive limestone formations have acted as seals to the Bakken Formation hydrocarbons and contributed to the trapping and development of mature crude oil deposits (Energy Information Administration 2006).

Regional subsidence of the Williston Basin during the Cretaceous period and tectonic activity during the Laramide Orogeny produced geological anticlines that serve as traps for petroleum resources (Peterson 1995). Oil was first discovered in the Williston Basin at the Cedar Creek Anticline in the 1920s, and subsequent discoveries in North Dakota of the extensive Bakken Formation and other oil and gas producing formations resulted in the development of major oil fields since the 1950s. However, efficient oil recovery continued to be limited by technical hurdles until 2004 (Energy Information Administration 2006).

The hydrocarbon resources of the Bakken Formation are considered to be “continuous” across the entire formation, with the Middle Member of the Bakken Formation having the greatest porosity and permeability. The limestone sealing formations of the Madison Group above the Bakken serve to maintain internal pressure and thermal conditions, while preventing the petroleum from escaping (Energy Information Administration 2006). Improved horizontal well stimulation methods using advanced HF technology have greatly improved petroleum production rates and economic output of the formation’s substantial oil reserves since 2004 (Energy Information Administration 2006). Current drilling and HF technology used to release oil from the Bakken Formation includes deep vertical drilling to extend the well shaft to the target formation, followed by horizontal drilling of a lateral well shaft (parallel to the surface) within the target formation. A non-perforated well shaft is installed in the vertical section, while a perforated well shaft, ranging in length from 9,000 to nearly 11,000 feet, is installed in lateral sections of the well. If adequate hydrocarbon-bearing deposits are identified, the perforated lateral well shaft is used to deliver HF fluids and small compression-resistant particles called proppants into the target formation at high pressure, and to collect oil and other fluids from the well. Further discussion of HF technology and its potential effects on groundwater is included in Section 3.3.2.3.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

3.2.1 Air Quality Standards and Criteria Pollutants

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) (USC 7401–7671, as amended in 1990) established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for criteria pollutants to protect public health and welfare. It also set standards for other compounds that can cause cancer, regulated

emissions that cause acid rain, and required federal permits for large sources. NAAQS have been established for ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter (PM), and lead (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] 2011a). The primary NAAQS are set for pervasive compounds that are generally emitted by industry or motor vehicles. Standards for each pollutant meet specific public health and welfare criteria; thus, they are called the “criteria pollutants.”

The CAA mandates prevention of significant air quality deterioration in certain designated attainment areas and has designated more stringent air quality standards, known as Secondary Standards, for these areas. Class I attainment areas have national significance and include national parks greater than 6,000 acres, national monuments, national seashores, and federal wilderness areas larger than 5,000 acres that were designated prior to 1977 (Ross 1990). The Class I regulations (40 CFR 51.307) attempt to protect visibility through a review of major new and modified sources of pollutants, and requiring strict air quality emission standards if they would have an adverse impact on visibility within the Class I area (National Park Service 2010).

The nearest designated attainment area to the project area is the Theodore Roosevelt National Park (TRNP), a Class I area that covers about 110 square miles in three units within the Little Missouri National Grassland. The TRNP is located approximately 16 miles south of Watford City, North Dakota, and approximately 30 miles west of the proposed well sites. Two air quality monitoring stations are located within the TRNP, with the North Unit monitoring most criteria pollutants (National Park Service 2010; North Dakota Department of Health [NDDH] 2012). All other parts of the state, including the Reservation, are classified as Class II attainment areas, affording them protections through the Primary NAAQS (NDDH 2012).

Some states have adopted more stringent standards for criteria pollutants, or have chosen to adopt new standards for other pollutants. For instance, the NDDH has established a standard for hydrogen sulfide (H₂S) (NDDH 2012).

Criteria pollutants and their health effects include the following.

- Sulfur dioxide (SO₂) is a colorless gas with a strong, suffocating odor. SO₂ is produced by burning coal, fuel oil, and diesel fuel, and can trigger constriction of the airways, causing particular difficulties for asthmatics. Long-term exposure is associated with increased risk of mortality from respiratory or cardiovascular disease. SO₂ emissions are also a primary cause of acid rain and plant damage (EPA 2011a).
- Inhalable Particulate Matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) is a class of compounds that can lodge deep in the lungs, causing adverse health problems, depending on their size, concentration, and content. Based on extensive health studies, particulate matter is regulated under two classes. PM₁₀ is the fraction of total particulate matter 10 microns or smaller, and PM_{2.5} is two and a half microns or smaller. Inhalable particulate matter can range from inorganic wind-blown soil to organic and toxic compounds found in diesel exhaust. Toxic compounds such as benzene often find a route into the body via inhalation of fine particulate matter (EPA 2011a).

- Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) is a reddish-brown gas with an irritating odor. Primary sources include motor vehicles, industrial facilities, and power plants. In the summer months, NO₂ is a major component of photochemical smog. NO₂ is an irritating gas that may constrict airways, especially of asthmatics, and increase the susceptibility to infection in the general population. NO₂ is also involved in ozone smog production (EPA 2011a).
- Ozone (O₃) is a colorless gas with a pungent, irritating odor and creates a widespread air quality problem in most of the world's industrialized areas. Ozone smog is not emitted directly into the atmosphere but is primarily formed through the reaction of hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides in the presence of sunlight. Health effects related to O₃ can include reduced lung function, aggravated respiratory illness, and irritated eyes, nose, and throat. Chronic exposure can cause permanent damage to the alveoli of the lungs. O₃ can persist for many days after formation and travel several hundred miles (EPA 2011a).
- Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless, odorless gas that is a byproduct of incomplete combustion. CO concentrations typically peak nearest a source, such as roadways or areas with high fireplace use, and decrease rapidly as distance from the source increases. Ambient levels are typically found during periods of stagnant weather, such as on still winter evenings with a strong temperature inversion. CO is readily absorbed into the body from the air. It decreases the capacity of the blood to transport oxygen, leading to health risks for unborn children and people suffering from heart and lung disease. The symptoms of excessive exposure are headaches, fatigue, slow reflexes, and dizziness (EPA 2011a).

The Primary and Secondary NAAQS for criteria pollutants are summarized in Table 3.1. NEPA assessments require analysis of both near-field and far-field as part of the cumulative effects of proposed projects on air quality. Therefore, the North Dakota Ambient Air Quality Standards are shown as well as federal standards.

North Dakota has separate state standards for SO₂ and H₂S that are different from the federal criteria standards. All other state criteria pollutant standards are the same as federal. North Dakota was one of 13 states that met standards for all federal criteria pollutants in 2008.

In addition, the EPA averages data from monitoring stations within each county to determine the Air Quality Index (AQI), a general measure of air quality for residents of the county. An AQI greater than 100 is indicative of unhealthy air quality conditions for the county residents, although residents may experience greater or lesser risks depending on their proximity to the sources of pollutants (EPA 2011b).

Table 3.1. NAAQS and Other Air Quality Standards.

| Pollutant | Averaging Period | Primary Standard (NAAQS) | Secondary Standard (National Parks) | North Dakota AAQS |
|---|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| SO ₂ (parts per billion [ppb]) | 1-hour | 75 | - | 273 |
| | 3-hour | 500 | 500 | - |
| | 24-hour ¹ | 140 | - | 99 |
| | Annual (Arithmetic Average) | 30 | - | 23 |
| PM ₁₀ (micrograms per cubic meter of air [µg/m ³]) | 24-hour ² | 150 | - | 150 |
| | Expected annual mean | 50 | - | 50 |
| PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³) | 24-hour ³ | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| | Annual (Arithmetic Average) ⁴ | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| NO ₂ (ppb) | 1-hour ³ | 100 | - | - |
| | Annual mean | 53 | 53 | 53 |
| CO (parts per million [ppm]) | 1-hour ¹ | 35 | - | 35 |
| | 8-hour ¹ | 9 | - | 9 |
| O ₃ (ppb) | 1-hour ⁵ | 120 | 120 | 120 |
| | 8-hour ⁵ | 75 | 75 | - |
| Lead (µg/m ³) | Rolling 3-month average | 0.15 | 0.15 | 1.5 (quarterly mean) |
| H ₂ S (ppm) | Instantaneous | - | - | 10 |
| | 1-hour | - | - | 0.20 |
| | 24-hour | - | - | 0.10 |
| | 3-month | - | - | 0.02 |

Sources: EPA 2011a; NDDH 2012.

¹ Not to be exceeded more than once per year.

² Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years.

³ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentrations at each population-oriented monitor within an area must not exceed standard.

⁴ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the weighted annual mean must not exceed the standard.

⁵ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum must not exceed the standard.

3.2.2 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHGs). Some GHGs such as carbon dioxide (CO₂) occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes and human activities. Other GHGs (e.g., fluorinated gases) are created and emitted solely through human activities. The EPA (2011c) identifies the principal GHGs that enter the atmosphere because of human activities as the following.

- Carbon Dioxide (CO₂): CO₂ enters the atmosphere through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), solid waste, trees and wood products, and also as a result of other chemical reactions (e.g., manufacture of cement). CO₂ is also removed from the atmosphere (or “sequestered”) when it is absorbed by plants as part of the biological carbon cycle.
- Methane (CH₄): CH₄ is emitted during the production and transport of coal, natural gas, and oil. CH₄ emissions also result from livestock and other agricultural practices and by the decay of organic waste in municipal solid waste landfills.
- Nitrous Oxide (N₂O): N₂O is emitted during agricultural and industrial activities, as well as during combustion of fossil fuels and solid waste.
- Fluorinated Gases: Hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride are synthetic, powerful GHGs that are emitted from a variety of industrial processes. Fluorinated gases are typically emitted in small quantities, but are potent GHGs thought to contribute significantly to global warming processes (EPA 2011b).

CO₂ is the primary GHG, responsible for approximately 90% of radiative forcing (the rate of energy change as measured at the top of the atmosphere; can be positive [warmer] or negative [cooler]) (EPA 2011b). To simplify discussion of the various GHGs, the term “Equivalent CO₂ or CO₂e” has been developed. CO₂e is the amount of CO₂ that would cause the same level of radiative forcing as a unit of one of the other GHGs. For example, one ton of CH₄ has a CO₂e of 22 tons; therefore, 22 tons of CO₂ would cause the same level of radiative forcing as one ton of CH₄. N₂O has a CO₂e value of 310. Thus, control strategies often focus on the gases with the highest CO₂e value.

According to the Pew Center, “Over the past 50 years, the (worldwide) data on extreme temperatures have shown similar trends of rising temperatures: cold days, cold nights, and frosts occurred less frequently over time, while hot days, hot nights, and heat waves occurred more frequently” (Pew Center 2009). Generally, the earth’s temperature has increased about one degree Celsius since 1850 but some areas have seen an increase of four degrees. Sea levels are also rising, mountain glaciers are disappearing, and ocean currents, such as the Gulf Stream, are slowing (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC] 2007).

Observational evidence from all continents and most oceans shows that many natural systems are being affected by regional climate changes, particularly temperature increases. The IPCC Working Group I Fourth Assessment compiles and analyzes global data on climate change, and reports that warming of the climate system is evident from global observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice and rising global average sea level (IPCC 2007). Globally, 11 of the 12 years between 1995 and 2007 ranked among the warmest years in the instrumental record of global surface temperature since 1850 (IPCC 2007). The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency monitored data indicate that 21 of the previous 30 years (1979–2009) have had above average temperatures in the contiguous United States, with departures from average temperatures occurring with increasing frequency, as shown in Figure 3.2 (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency 2010).




Figure 3.2. Temperature anomalies in the contiguous United States, 1979–2009.

Many physical and biological effects have been observed to correlate with trends in global warming. Sea levels are rising worldwide and along much of the United States coast (EPA 2011b). Tide gauge measurements and satellite altimetry suggest that the sea level has risen worldwide approximately 4.8 to 8.8 inches during the last century (IPCC 2007). A significant amount of sea level rise has likely resulted from the observed warming of the atmosphere and the oceans. Hydrological systems, ice pack, and permafrost are also affected by higher oceanic and atmospheric temperatures, affecting biological systems and agriculture (IPCC 2007).

IPCC experts concluded that most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperature since the mid-twentieth century is very likely due to the observed increase in anthropogenic GHG concentrations (IPCC 2007).

Therefore, the EPA collects data on and encourages limiting or reducing emissions of anthropogenic sources of GHGs to the earth's atmosphere (EPA 2011c). Many U.S. states have adopted goals and actions to reduce GHGs. The EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration have increased corporate fuel economy standards to promote national energy security and reduce GHGs. Standards would equal 35 miles per gallon by 2020, with an estimated savings to drivers of \$100 billion annually (EPA 2011c).

On May 13, 2010, the EPA issued a final rule that establishes thresholds for GHG emissions that define when permits under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant

Deterioration and title V Operating Permit programs are required for new and existing industrial facilities (EPA 2011c). This final rule “tailors” the requirements of these CAA permitting programs to limit which facilities would be required to obtain Prevention of Significant Deterioration and title V permits. Facilities responsible for nearly 70% of the national GHG emissions from stationary sources would be subject to permitting requirements under this rule. This includes the nation’s largest GHG emitters—power plants, refineries, and cement production facilities. Emissions from small farms, restaurants, and all but the very largest commercial facilities are not covered by these programs at this time; however, the EPA recently initiated additional hearings to help determine the types of industries to be held to new standards under these federal permits (EPA 2011c).

Energy production and supply was estimated to emit up to 25.9% of GHGs world-wide in 2004 (Pew Center 2009). CH₄, with a high radiative forcing CO₂e ratio, is a common fugitive gas emission in oil and gas fields (EPA 2011b). Oil and gas production, however, is highly variable in potential GHG emissions. Oil and gas producers in the United States are not considered large GHG emitters by the EPA, and are not the subject of any current federal proposals that would regulate GHG emissions.

3.2.3 Hazardous Air Pollutants

Hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) are a class of compounds known to cause cancer, mutation, or other serious health problems. HAPs are usually a localized problem near the emission source. HAPs are regulated separately from criteria air pollutants. There are several hundred HAPs recognized by the EPA and State of North Dakota. Health effects of HAPs may occur at exceptionally low levels; for many HAPs, it is not possible to identify exposure levels that do *not* produce adverse health effects. Major sources of toxic air contaminants include industrial processes, commercial operations (e.g., gasoline stations and dry cleaners), wood smoke, and motor vehicle exhaust. Unlike regulations for criteria pollutants, there are no ambient air quality standards for HAPs. Examples of HAPs found in gases released by oil field development and operation include benzene, toluene, xylene, and formaldehyde (BLM 2009). HAP emissions receive evaluation based on the degree of exposure that can cause risk of premature mortality, usually from cancer.

Risk assessments express premature mortality in terms of the number of deaths expected per one million persons. The NDDH typically reviews projects and either requires an applicant to prepare a risk assessment or assign the state engineers to conduct the assessment. For new sources emitting HAPs with known negative health effects, an applicant must demonstrate that the combined impact of new HAP emission does not result in a maximum individual cancer risk greater than one in one hundred thousand.

3.2.4 Existing Air Quality in the Project Area

Federal air quality standards apply in the project area, which is designated as a Class II attainment area. Although the State of North Dakota does not have jurisdiction over air quality matters on the Reservation and no air quality monitoring stations occur within the boundaries of the Reservation, monitoring efforts are being made by the state and industry in the area. The NDDH operates a network of monitoring stations around the state that continuously measure pollution levels. Industry also operates monitoring stations as required

by the state. The data from all these stations are subject to quality assurance, and when approved, it is published on the Internet and available from EPA and NDDH (NDDH 2012).

Monitoring stations providing complete data near the project site include Theodore Roosevelt National Park North Unit (TRNP-NU) (Air Quality Station #380530002) in McKenzie County, and Dunn Center (Air Quality Station #38025003) in Dunn County. These stations are located west and southeast of the proposed well sites, respectively. Bear Paw Energy and Amerada Hess operate site-specific monitoring stations in the region. However, these stations do not provide complete data that would be applicable to this analysis (NDDH 2012).

Criteria pollutants measured at the two monitoring stations include SO₂, PM₁₀, NO₂, and O₃. Lead and CO are not monitored by the two stations. Table 3.2 summarizes the NAAQS and the maximum levels of criteria pollutants. The highest value at either of the two monitoring locations is shown for each year from 2007 through 2010.

Table 3.2. Maximum Levels of Monitored Pollutants, 2007–2010, as Measured at Dunn Center and Theodore Roosevelt National Park North Unit Monitoring Stations.

| Criteria Pollutant | Averaging Period | Primary Standard (NAAQS) | North Dakota AAQS | Maximum Reported Level from Dunn Center and TRNP-NU Monitoring Stations | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|-------------------|---|------|------|------|
| | | | | 2010 | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 |
| SO ₂ (parts per billion [ppb]) | 1-hour | 75 | 273 | 25.8 | 20.3 | 20.9 | 22 |
| | 3-hour | 500 | - | 16.3 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 10 |
| | 24-hour ¹ | 140 | 99 | 4.1 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 4 |
| | Annual (Arithmetic Average) | 30 | 23 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 1.1 |
| PM ₁₀ (micrograms per cubic meter or air [µg/m ³]) | 24-hour ² | 150 | 150 | 32.0 | 54 | 108 | 57.4 |
| | Expected annual mean | 50 | 50 | 9.7 | 11.3 | 14.2 | 13.2 |
| PM _{2.5} (µg/m ³) | 24-hour ³ | 35 | 35 | 27.3 | 15.0 | 35.7 | 22.2 |
| | Annual (Arithmetic Average) ⁴ | 15 | 15 | 8.6 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 3.6 |
| NO ₂ (ppb) | 1-hour ³ | 100 | - | 24 | 15 | 24 | 26 |
| | Annual mean | 53 | 53 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.5 |
| O ₃ (ppb) | 1-hour ⁵ | 120 | 120 | 73 | 67 | 69 | 76 |
| | 8-hour ⁵ | 75 | - | 70 | 58 | 63 | 71 |

Source: NDDH 2012.

¹ Not to be exceeded more than once per year.

² Not to be exceeded more than once per year on average over 3 years.

³ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of 24-hour concentrations at each population-oriented monitor within an area must not exceed standard.

⁴ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the weighted annual mean must not exceed the standard.

⁵ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the fourth-highest daily maximum must not exceed the standard.

All monitored criteria pollutants are well below federal and state standards measured at the monitoring stations for all years in the study period from 2007 through 2011. In addition to the low levels of monitored criteria pollutants, the EPA reports that McKenzie County had only one day in which the AQI exceeded 100 in 2007 through 2011, indicating that general air quality does not pose an unhealthy condition for residents of this county (EPA 2012a).

3.2.5 Typical Project Emissions from Oilfield Development

According to EPA Emission Inventory Improvement documents (EPA 1999), oil field emissions encompass three primary areas: combustion, fugitive, and vented. Typical processes that occur during exploration and production include the following.

- Combustion emissions include SO₂, ozone precursors called volatile organic compounds (VOCs), GHGs, and HAPs. Sources include engine exhaust, dehydrators, and flaring (EPA 1999).
- Fugitive emissions include criteria pollutants, H₂S, VOCs, HAPs, and GHGs. Sources of fugitive emissions include mechanical leaks from well field equipment such as valves, flanges, and connectors that may occur in heater/treaters, separators, pipelines, wellheads, and pump stations. Pneumatic devices such as gas actuated pumps and pressure/level controllers also result in fugitive emissions. Other sources of fugitive emissions include evaporation ponds and pits, condensate tanks, storage tanks, and wind-blown dust (from truck and construction activity) (EPA 1999).
- Vented emissions include GHGs, VOCs, and HAPs. Primary sources are emergency pressure relief valves and dehydrator vents (EPA 1999).

Pad and road construction, drilling activities, and tanker traffic would generate emissions of criteria pollutants and HAPs. Primary emissions sources during drilling are diesel exhaust, wind-blown dust from disturbed areas and travel on dirt roads, evaporation from pits and sumps, and gas venting. Diesel emissions are being progressively controlled by the EPA in a nationwide program (EPA 2011c). This program takes a two-pronged approach. First, fuels are improving to the ultra-low sulfur standard, and secondly manufacturers must produce progressively lower engine emissions.

3.2.6 Air Quality Best Management Practices

Under the CAA, federal land management agencies have an affirmative responsibility to protect air quality. Tribes, federal land managers, and private entities can make emission controls part of a lease agreement. BMPs can be adopted for various portions of an oil/gas well's lifecycle. BMPs fall into the following six general categories.

- Transportation BMPs to reduce the amount of fugitive dust and vehicle emissions
 - Use directional drilling to drill multiple wells from a single well pad.
 - Use centralized water storage and delivery, well HF, gathering systems.
 - Use telemetry to remotely monitor and control production.
 - Use water or dust suppressants to control fugitive dust on roads.

- Control road speeds.
- Use van or carpooling.
- Drilling BMPs to reduce rig emissions
 - Use cleaner diesel (Tier 2, 3, and 4) engines.
 - Use natural gas-powered engines.
 - Use “green” completions to recapture product that otherwise would have been vented or flared.
- Unplanned or emergency releases
 - Use high-temperature flaring if gas is not recoverable.
- Vapor recovery
 - Use enclosed tanks instead of open pits to reduce fugitive VOC emissions.
 - Use vapor recovery units on storage tanks.
- Inspection and maintenance
 - Use and maintain proper hatches, seals, and valves.
 - Optimize glycol circulation and install a flash tank separator.
 - Use selective catalytic reduction.
 - Replace high-bleed with low-bleed devices on pneumatic pumps.
- Monitoring and repair
 - Use directed inspection and maintenance methods to identify and cost-effectively fix fugitive gas leaks.
 - Install an air quality monitoring station.

3.2.7 Potential Air Quality Impacts

Based on the existing air quality of the region and the typical air emissions of similar oil field projects, and implementation of BMPs identified in Section 3.2.6, the Proposed Action would not lead to significant increases in criteria pollutants, GHGs, or HAPs.

3.3 WATER RESOURCES

This section identifies the existing water resources within the project area and potential effects of the project on those resources. Specific subjects discussed in this section include surface water and surface water quality, groundwater resources, HF, and the potential short-term and long-term impacts of the proposed project on these water resources.

3.3.1 Surface Water

The surface water resources in the project area would be managed and protected according to existing federal law and policies regarding the use, storage, and disposal of this resource during the construction and operation of the project. Surface water resource use and protection is administered under the following federal laws:

- Clean Water Act of 1972 (CWA), as amended (33 USC 1251 et seq.)
- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 USC 1711–1712)
- NEPA of 1969, as amended (42 USC 4321)
- Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended (42 USC 300 et seq.)

Water quality is protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as amended), otherwise known as the CWA. The CWA has developed rules for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the U.S. and also regulates water quality standards for surface waters. The CWA has also made it unlawful to discharge any pollutant from a point source into any navigable waters of the U.S., unless a permit has been obtained from the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.

The Environmental Division of the MHA Nation has had an application pending with the EPA since 1996 for delegation of authority to set federally approved water quality standards on the Reservation. In the absence of tribal surface water quality authorities, enforcement of federal environmental laws regarding surface water on the Reservation is accomplished through permitting, inspection, and monitoring activities of the NPDES, as administered by the EPA.

Surface water is abundant in the project area, as shown in Figure 3.3 (North Dakota Department of Health, Division of Water Quality 2011). The project components in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, would be located within the Lake Sakakawea subbasin (hydrologic unit code [HUC] 10110101) and the Antelope Creek State Wildlife Management Area watershed (HUC 1011010118). Water would flow from this well pad and access road into the Antelope Creek subwatershed (HUC 101101011803) and travel east then northeast until reaching Lake Sakakawea, as shown in Figure 3.4. This proposed location is approximately 7.59 river miles from the nearest perennial stream (Antelope Creek) and 11.03 river miles from Lake Sakakawea. The well pad is 0.16 mile (850 feet) from the closest wooded draw.

The project components in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, would be located within the Lake Sakakawea subbasin and the Bear Den Creek watershed (HUC 1011010120). Water would flow from this well pad and access road into the Upper Bear Den Creek subwatershed (HUC 101101012001) and travel north then east until reaching Lake Sakakawea, as shown in Figure 3.5. This proposed location is 7.18 river miles from the nearest perennial stream (Bear Den Creek) and 23.55 river miles from Lake Sakakawea. The well pad is 0.06 mile (330 feet) from the closest wooded draw.




Figure 3.3. Watersheds, aquifers, and existing water wells near the project areas (North Dakota Department of Health, Division of Water Quality 2011).




Figure 3.4. Surface runoff and drainage direction from the proposed well pad in Section 19, T152N, R94W.




Figure 3.5. Surface runoff and drainage direction from the proposed well pad in Section 36, T149N, R95W.

A query of the EPA Storage and Retrieval Water Quality Database for the Lake Sakakawea, Bear Den Creek, and Antelope Creek State Wildlife Management Area watersheds showed that water quality data were not available from within the project area (EPA 2011d). However, the overall water quality status of the Upper Bear Den Creek and Antelope Creek subwatersheds was classified as good in the EPA Watershed Assessment, Tracking and Environmental Results database (EPA 2012b). Furthermore, standards for specific priority pollutants have not been developed for the project area or the Reservation. No ongoing discharge of water to surface waters of the U.S. would be required for this project. This project would comply with all the specific terms and conditions of the NPDES Construction Permit, in accordance with Section 402 of the CWA (EPA 2011e).

During the May and June 2012 on-site visits, the BIA made site-specific recommendations for design measures that would reduce or minimize surface runoff and potential surface water degradation from the construction of the new wells and access roads. Enerplus has adopted the site-specific erosion protection measures identified in Table 2.1 and further discussed in Section 3.4.6. These measures would reduce long-term erosion and runoff from the sites, protecting surface water resources.

As part of the NPDES Construction Permit, the proposed project would be engineered and constructed to minimize the suspended sediment (i.e., turbidity) concentration of surface runoff, avoid disruption of drainages, and avoid direct impacts to surface water. No surface water would be used for well drilling operations. Any chemicals or potentially hazardous materials would be handled in accordance with the operator's spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan. Provisions established under this plan would minimize potential impacts to any surface waters associated with an accidental spill. Please refer to Section 3.4 for a discussion of the soil erodibility hazard within the project area.

3.3.2 Groundwater

3.3.2.1 Groundwater Aquifers and Typical Groundwater Quality

Aquifers in the project area and surrounding region include, from deepest to shallowest, the Cretaceous Fox Hills and Hell Creek formations and the Tertiary Cannonball/Ludlow, Tongue River, and Sentinel Butte formations (Table 3.3). The aquifers in question lie at depths from 670 to 2,000 feet below the surface. Shallow post-glacial outwash aquifers are located elsewhere in the Williston Basin, but do not occur within the proposed project area. Shallow wells drilled to the upper member of the Fort Union Group and the Tongue River Formation at depths ranging from 100 to 750 feet below the surface are often used for cattle watering. These wells typically contain total dissolved solid levels less than 3,000 parts per million (ppm). The shallow Sentinel Butte Formation is commonly used as a domestic water source in McKenzie County and meets standards of the NDDH (Croft 1985). Many wells are drilled for domestic purposes throughout the Williston Basin in the basal Fox Hills Sand at depths ranging from 1,300 to 1,800 feet deep. The total dissolved solids level of the Fox Hills aquifer is normally 2,500 to 3,000 ppm, producing good drinking water. Detailed analyses are available from the North Dakota Geological Survey, Bulletin 68, Part III (Klausing 1979).

Table 3.3. Common Aquifers in the Proposed Project Area and Surrounding Region.

| Period | Formation | | Depth Range (feet) | Thickness (feet) | Lithology | Water-Yielding Characteristics |
|------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Quaternary | Alluvium | | 0–40 | 40 | Silt, sand, and gravel | 50 gal/min from sand and gravel deposits |
| Tertiary | Fort Union Group | Sentinel Butte | 0–670 | 0–670 | Silt, clay, sand, and lignite | 5 to 100 gal/min in sandstone. 1 to 200 gal/min in lignite |
| | | Tongue River | 140–750 | 350–490 | Silt, clay, sand, and lignite | Generally less than 100 gal/min in sandstone |
| | | Cannonball/Ludlow | 500–1,150 | 550–660 | Fine- to medium-grained sandstone, siltstone, and lignite | Generally less than 50 gal/min in sandstone |
| Cretaceous | Hell Creek | | 1,000–1,750 | 200–300 | Claystone, sandstone, and mudstone | 5 to 100 gal/min in sandstone |
| | Fox Hills | | 1,100–2,000 | 200–300 | Fine- to medium-grained sandstone and some shale | Generally less than 200 gal/min in sandstone; some up to 400 gal/min |

Sources: Croft 1985; Klausning 1979.
gal/min = gallons per minute

3.3.2.2 Existing Groundwater Wells

Data from the North Dakota State Water Commission indicate that there are no existing groundwater wells within 1 mile and eight groundwater wells within 5 miles of the proposed well pad locations (Figure 3.3) (North Dakota State Water Commission 2011).

3.3.2.3 Hydraulic Fracturing Process

HF is a well stimulation process used in North Dakota's Bakken and Three Forks formations to maximize the extraction of oil and gas. The process enhances subsurface fracture systems, allowing oil to move more freely through porous rock to production wells that bring the oil or gas to the surface (EPA 2011f). During HF, fluids, commonly made up of water and chemical additives, are pumped down the well bore into these target formations at high pressure. The HF process uses large volumes of water under high pressure to fracture rock within the target formation to increase formation porosity and allow the flow of hydrocarbons from the rock. Depending upon the characteristics of the well and the rock being fractured, a few million gallons of water can be required to complete one HF job (Arthur et al. 2008).

Only specific sections of the well within the target formation receive the full force of pumping. As pressure builds up in this portion of the well, water opens fractures, and the driving pressure extends the fractures deep into the rock unit. When pumping stops, these fractures quickly snap closed and the water used to open them is pushed back into the borehole, back up the well and is collected at the surface. The water returned to the surface is a mixture of the water injected and pore water that has been trapped in the rock unit for millions of years. The pore water is usually a brine with significant amounts of dissolved solids (Arthur et al. 2008).

When the pressure exceeds the rock strength, the fluids open or enlarge fractures that can extend several hundred feet from the well shaft, which is oriented laterally within the target formation. After the fractures are created, a propping agent is pumped into the fractures to keep them from closing when the pumping pressure is released. After HF is completed, the internal pressure of the geologic formation causes the injected HF fluids to rise to the surface where they are stored in disposal tanks (EPA 2011f).

Proppants are small compression-resistant particles added to the HF fluids to assist in holding the fractures open and creating pore space through which petroleum can flow. Sand was the original proppant but now aluminum beads, ceramic beads, sintered aluminum (aka bauxite), and other materials are being used in the wells. Over one million pounds of proppants can be used while HF a single well (Arthur et al. 2008).

In addition to proppants, a variety of chemical additives are included with the water used in HF. Some chemicals are used to thicken the water into a gel that is more effective at opening fractures and carrying proppants deep into the rock unit. Other chemicals are added to reduce friction, keep rock debris suspended in the liquid, prevent corrosion of equipment, kill bacteria, control pH, and other functions (Arthur et al. 2008). Typical chemical additives used in the HF fluids are listed in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Common Additives of Hydraulic Fracturing Fluid.

| Additive Type | Main Compound | Common Use of Main Compound |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Acid | Hydrochloric acid or muriatic acid | Swimming pool chemical and cleaner |
| Biocide | Glutaraldehyde | Cold sterilant in health care industry |
| Breaker | Sodium chloride | Food preservative |
| Corrosion inhibitor | N,n-dimethyl formamide | Used as a crystallization medium in pharmaceutical industry |
| Friction reducer | Petroleum distillate | Cosmetics including hair, make-up, nail, and skin products |
| Gel | Guar gum or hydroxyethyl cellulose | Thickener used in cosmetics, sauces, and salad dressings |
| Iron control | 2-hydroxy-1,2,3-propanetricarboxylic acid | Citric acid is used to remove lime deposits; lemon juice ~7% citric acid |
| Oxygen scavenger | Ammonium bisulfite | Used in cosmetics |
| Proppant | Silica, quartz sand | Play sand |
| Scale inhibitor | Ethylene glycol | Automotive antifreeze and de-icing agent |

Source: Arthur et al. 2008.

3.3.3 Potential Impacts to Surface Water and Groundwater Resources

Water quality of future wells in the vicinity would be protected by drilling with freshwater to a point below the base of the Fox Hills Formation, implementing proper hazardous materials management, and using appropriate casing and cementing to permanently seal the well shaft from any surrounding aquifers. Surface casing would be employed to a depth of 2,500 feet below ground surface to isolate and protect all near-surface aquifers from contamination during drilling, as described in Section 2.2.5 of this document, and to protect the potable water aquifers from any potential contamination during the drilling and operations phases.

Since the introduction of technological advances in HF, some environmental concerns have been published related to the use of chemical additives and their potential effect on groundwater resources. These concerns, reviewed in Arthur et al. (2008), include the following.

1. Fractures produced in the well might extend directly into shallow rock units that are used for drinking water supplies, or fractures produced in the well might communicate with natural fractures that extend into shallow rock units that are used for drinking water supplies.
2. The casing of a well might fail and allow fluids to escape into shallow rock units used for drinking water supplies.
3. Accidental spills of HF fluids or fluids expelled during HF might seep into the ground or contaminate surface water.

The EPA has studied the effects of coalbed methane well fracturing, publishing the results in a report entitled *Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs* (EPA 816-R-04-003) in 2004 (EPA 2004). The report has received both internal and external peer review, and public comment on its research design and incident information. Based on its research, the EPA concluded that there was negligible risk of HF fluid contaminating underground sources of drinking water during HF of coalbed methane production wells, which are significantly more shallow than the Bakken and Three Forks formations. However, the EPA continues to monitor the effects of HF in coalbed methane well completion (EPA 2004). The EPA is currently undertaking a study to evaluate the effect of oilfield HF technology, processes, and fluids on potable water aquifers. The EPA study is not expected to be completed until 2012 (EPA 2011f).

Oil-bearing formations typically occur much deeper than potable water aquifers. In addition, the unique geological position of the Bakken Formation places it immediately beneath the Madison Group, as shown in Figure 3.1. The Madison group of Mississippian age includes three geological formations that have properties that greatly limit the possibility of HF fractures extending vertically into shallower geological formations containing potable water. The following characteristics of the three members of the Madison Group show extremely high resistance to fracturing or vertical transmission of fluids.

3.3.3.1 Lodgepole Limestone Sequence

This is a sequence of primarily Mississippian limestones, with scattered interbedded shales approximately 900 feet thick. It lies immediately above the Bakken Formation. This sequence

of rocks is characterized as hard and very dense, requiring significant pressure to initiate fractures (Energy Information Administration 2006).

3.3.3.2 Mission Canyon Limestone

Like the Lodgepole Limestone, the Mission Canyon is a dense limestone formation with very low porosity that ranges from 500 to 800 feet thick (Figure 3.1). Any HF pressures within the Bakken Formation that might be sufficient to initiate fracturing of the Lodgepole Limestone are assumed to be greatly reduced before reaching the Mission Canyon Limestone Formation, and very unlikely to cause any fracturing or transmission of fluids.

3.3.3.3 Charles Salt

The Charles Salt is ubiquitous throughout a great portion of the Williston Basin in both Montana and North Dakota and lies immediately above the limestones described above. This salt formation is approximately 600 feet thick. At the depth below the surface and the associated pressures, this salt is ductile, and would flow slowly to fill any void created by drilling or other pressure. This “flow characteristic,” although very challenging to well drilling, would serve to seal any potential fracture that might be propagated artificially through HF. The salt would flow completely around the HF fluids or proppant, thereby eliminating any opportunity for the artificially induced fracture to stay open. Further, the water from the Bakken is almost fully salt-saturated; even with water flow from the Bakken to the Charles Salt Formation, there could be almost no dissolution to enhance any fracture, and the formation would form a barrier, or cap, for any potential HR fracture.

Above the Charles Salt lie greater than 6,000 feet of limestones, siltstones, interbedded salts, sandstones, and shales, many of which tend to be soft and incompetent, providing a serious impediment to any fracture height growth and redirecting and attenuating any fracture that is started. The multiple layers encountered would also serve to dissipate any energy from a fracture stimulation resulting in very limited fracture competency.

Potable water aquifers lie approximately 4,000 feet above the Bakken Formation. In general, almost any of the intervening rock packages appear to be able to independently act as an effective impediment to fracture growth in a vertical direction. Although large volumes of sand (proppant) are used in the modern, multi-stage fracture stimulations, relatively small amounts of proppant are used per stage and are specifically designed to limit fracture growth. This technology is highly unlikely to result in fractures that could expand through the Madison Group limestones or reach the Charles Salt Formation.

No direct or indirect impacts to surface water or groundwater resources would be anticipated from drilling the proposed wells, HF completions, or operation of the proposed wells due to the following.

- The geological setting of the Bakken and Three Forks formations with extremely tight capping formations of the Madison Unit forming an impermeable barrier to upward fracturing or fluid movement.
- The use of semi-closed-loop drilling, as specified in Table 2.1, construction BMPs, and spill prevention planning during the construction phase of the project.

- Implementation of site-specific measures designed to reduce long-term erosion and runoff into nearby streams and Lake Sakakawea.
- The use of protective casings on the well shafts to protect shallow water-bearing rock formations during drilling and operation of the oil wells.

3.4 SOILS

The project area is located toward the center of the Williston Basin. The Greenhorn Formation, which consists of thin limestone and dark gray to black organic-rich shale, is found from the surface to a depth of approximately 4,000 feet. The Greenhorn is subdivided into lower and upper intervals of limestone and calcareous shale with a middle interval of shale. Near-surface sediment is of Recent, Pleistocene, or Tertiary age, and includes Sauk, Tippecanoe, Kaskaskia, Absaroka, Zuni, and Tejas sequences.

The project area consists of till plains and upland soils developed from a variety of landforms including gentle sloping plains and rises (3 to 6 percent slopes) to steeper hill slopes and ridges (6 to 15 percent slopes). Textures are primarily loams in soils derived from alluvium, residuum, and colluvium weathered from sedimentary rock and glacial deposits (Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS] 2012a). Mean annual precipitation found throughout the project area ranges from 13 to 18 inches and mean annual air temperature ranges from 39°F to 45°F. Vegetation common to these soils includes range and pasture grass species of the midgrass prairie and woodland vegetation on steeper, wetter slopes. Soils in and surrounding the project area are often cultivated for grain and/or hay and pasture, with frost-free periods ranging from 120 to 135 days.

A vast number of soil series and components (see Appendix B) occur within the proposed project area as a result of weathering of several geomorphic features with differentiated geologic substrate, which have been categorized into two soil groups based on geomorphology: hills and ridges; and plains and rises.

3.4.1 Hills and Ridges

The most predominant geomorphic soil group in the project area is soils of hills and ridges, making up approximately 12.05 acres (99.8 percent) of the project area (Table 3.5). These well-drained soils occur in diverse topographic terrain (6 to 15 percent slopes) on hills and ridges weathered from glacial till and loamy residuum derived from mixed sources (NRCS 2012a). Soils weathered on hills and ridges are generally deep but may also include more shallow soils with restrictive layers at 10 to 40 inches. The soil surface layer is typically 2 to 7 inches thick of loam. These soils are susceptible to sheetflow erosion (slope).

The hazard of water erosion increases on slopes greater than about 15 percent (NRCS 2012b). Some flow paths, rills, and pedestaled plants may be evident on these slopes. Reclamation potential of these soils is poor to good and is based on depth to bedrock, texture, and sodium content (NRCS 2012a).

Table 3.5. Soil Groups within the Project Area.

| Soil Group | Soil Map Units | Surface Runoff | Erodibility Rating | Reclamation Potential | Ecological Site | Surface Disturbance (Acres) ¹ | % of Surface Disturbance |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Hills and ridges | 42C | Very low to very high | Low to severe | Poor to good | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | 12.05 | 99.8 |
| | 44D | | | | Thin Loamy (R054XY038ND) | | |
| | 51C | | | | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | | |
| | 71C | | | | Clayey (R054XY020ND) | | |
| Plains and rises | 41B | Medium | Moderate | Good | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | 0.03 | 0.2 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | 12.08 | 100.0 |

¹ Surface disturbance acreage does not include all lands within the fenced perimeter of the well pads. These values only include actual surface disturbance involved in the construction of the project.

3.4.2 Plains and Rises

These soils cover approximately 0.03 acre (0.2 percent) of the project area (Table 3.5). This soil group is characterized by deep, well-drained loams typically found in gently rolling terrain (3 to 6 percent slopes). These soils formed in fine, loamy till (NRCS 2012a). The soil surface layer is often very shallow and characterized by clay loams and loams.

The soil surface of these soils is typically stable and intact, although these soils typically have an increased composition of stones and boulders. Areas of intact vegetation should exhibit slight to no evidence of rills, wind scoured areas, or pedestaled plants (NRCS 2012b). These soils have no to very few soil constraints and reclamation potential is good.

3.4.3 Project-Specific Surface Disturbance

The overall percentage of surface disturbance for each soil series is summarized in Table 3.6 and is based on the spatial extent of soil series derived from NRCS data. The soil map units are approximations of the existing soils across the landscape acreage and, therefore, used as a best estimate to describe the soil distribution for each of the proposed project areas. A vast number of soil series occurs within the project area as a result of weathering of surfaces of several geomorphic features with differentiated geologic substrate (Figures 3.6 and 3.7). Soil component characteristics for each soil series are described in Appendix B (NRCS 2012a).

Table 3.6. Percentage of the Project Area Disturbance Comprised of Specific Soil Components.

| Map Symbol | Soil Series | Acres ¹ | % of Project Area Disturbance |
|---|---|--------------------|-------------------------------|
| NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF | | | |
| 44D | Zahl-Williams loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes | 3.55 | 58.8 |
| 42C | Williams loam, 6 to 9 percent slopes | 2.46 | 40.7 |
| 41B | Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes | 0.03 | 0.5 |
| TOTAL | | 6.04 | 100.0 |
| NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H | | | |
| 71C | Regent-Janesburg complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes | 4.01 | 66.4 |
| 51C | Amor-Cabba loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes | 2.03 | 33.6 |
| TOTAL | | 6.04 | 100.0 |

¹Surface disturbance acreage does not include all lands within the fenced perimeter of the well pad. These values only include actual surface disturbance involved in the construction of the project.




Figure 3.6. Approximate spatial extent of soil components within and around the project area located in Section 19, T152N, R94W.




Figure 3.7. Approximate spatial extent of soil components within and around the project area located in Section 36, T149N, R95W.

3.4.4 Field Descriptions

Soil data derived from on-site excavated soil pits, including the matrix value, hue, chroma, color name, and soil texture, are summarized in Table 3.7. A Munsell Soil Color Chart was used to determine the color of moist soil samples.

Table 3.7. Soil Data Obtained through the Excavation of Soil Pits within the Proposed Project Area.

| Project Area Component | Depth (inches) | % of Sample | Soil Matrix Color (color name) | Texture | Topsoil Depth (inches) | Topography Slope (%) |
|---|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF | | | | | | |
| Well pad | 0-6 | 100 | 7.5YR 3/2 | Loam | 6 | 0-5 |
| Access road | 0-4 | 100 | 7.5YR 3/2 | Loam | 6 | 0-5 |
| Access road | 4-20 | 100 | 10YR 6/2 | Clay loam | 6 | 0-5 |
| NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H | | | | | | |
| Well pad | 0-5 | 100 | 10YR 3/2 | Silty clay loam | 12 | 0-10 |
| Well pad | 5-20 | 85 | 2.5YR 5/2 | Sandy clay loam | 12 | 0-10 |
| Well pad | 5-20 | 15 | 10YR 3/2 | Silty clay loam | 12 | 0-10 |

3.4.5 Potential Impacts from Soil Erosion

The proposed project would involve short-term impacts on soil resources, which could result in the potential reduction of soil quality. Impacts would result from soil disturbance due to the use of heavy machinery, the removal of vegetation, and intermixing of topsoil and subsoil during grading and stockpiling. Important factors in determining the occurrence of soil impacts include the characteristics of the major soil types, vegetative cover, and slope. This section discusses potential soil impacts throughout the proposed project areas.

Sensitive soils typically include soils that have shallow depth to bedrock; minimal surface layer organic material content and structure; soil textures that are more easily detached and eroded; or are on steep slopes (greater than 25 percent) (NRCS 1998). Susceptibility to erosion may substantially increase when particular features are in combination. The soil map unit rates all soils on their susceptibility to water erosion. Wind erosion may also be a hazard, particularly when surface litter and vegetation are removed by surface disturbing activities.

As vegetative cover is removed and the structural stability of the soil is disrupted, the potential for erosion increases. This potential degree of erosion depends upon slope, runoff probability, soil texture, and soil structure. Finely textured soils with poor structure are generally more prone to water erosion than coarse, sandy soils. Silt loams and silty clay loams are particularly vulnerable to water erosion due to their fine particle size and decreased cohesiveness. However, elevated sandy textures make soils more sensitive to wind erosion. The project area includes soils that are susceptible to erosive forces, especially in the absence

of vegetative cover following grading and compaction from heavy machinery. Steep slopes can be highly susceptible to erosion regardless of soil texture.

Some potential for erosion to occur may exist in the project area, depending on surface disturbance, site-specific slope, soil type, erosion risk, and construction technique and/or long-term maintenance. Soil erodibility ratings are determined by evaluating the erosion susceptibility (i.e., wind and water erosion factors) with terrain slope and content of rock fragments (NRCS 1998). Erosion risk is described as slight, moderate, or severe (Table 3.5). Slight ratings indicate that no erosion is likely, whereas a moderate rating indicates that erosion is likely but can be controlled with simple erosion control measures. However, a severe erodibility rating indicates that significant erosion is expected and that more costly and active erosion-control measures will be necessary. Keeping in mind the general and site-specific measures identified in Table 2.1, the potential impacts from erosion are discussed in detail for each proposed well pad.

3.4.5.1 NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF

- The proposed well pad, access road, and utility corridor would occur in soils that are predominantly Zahl and Williams loams (approximately 59 percent), soils with fair reclamation potential.
- Soils in the well pad, access road, and utility corridor locations have medium surface runoff and a moderate erosion risk, primarily due to clay content and slope.
- 6.04 acres of temporary surface disturbance would occur during construction. The topography in the project area ranges from 0 to 5 percent on and around the well pad (Table 3.7), but requires some site leveling with cut of 39,690 cubic yards of earth, and fill of 33,160 cubic yards.

3.4.5.2 NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H

- The proposed well pad, access road, and utility corridor would occur in soils that are predominantly Regent-Janesburg complex (approximately 66 percent), soils with poor to fair reclamation potential.
- Soils in the well pad, access road, and utility corridor locations have medium to very high surface runoff and a moderate to severe erosion risk, primarily due to sodium content, clay content, and depth to bedrock.
- 6.04 acres of temporary surface disturbance would occur during construction. The topography in the project area ranges from 0 to 10 percent on and around the well pad (Table 3.7), but requires some site leveling with cut of 46,510 cubic yards of earth, and fill of 35,140 cubic yards.

3.4.6 Erosion Control Measures

During construction, some soils may become rutted and compacted under construction traffic. Factors that influence rutting and compaction include soil moisture, soil texture, grain size distribution, and porosity. For instance, heavily graded soils with some silt content that are not

overly wet or dry tend to compact more than uniform sands. Some soils in the project area are more susceptible to compaction and it is anticipated that soil decompaction measures would be required on disturbed surfaces. To minimize the potential for rutting and compaction, the operator would avoid construction activity during periods of soil saturation in flood-prone areas, when practicable.

Soil properties that affect the growth of native grasses and shrubs include the topsoil thickness for the root zone, texture of the surface layer, available water capacity, wetness, salinity and sodicity, flood hazard, soil temperature, and slope. With the existing conditions along the project alignment, reclamation and revegetation would be limited in a number of soil types.

Most of the soils in the project area are known to support native grassland vegetation, which may substantially increase the probability for successful and permanent reclamation, provided care is taken in areas where the soils are less than ideal for vegetative growth (NRCS 2012a). Proven construction BMPs are known to significantly reduce erosion of various types of soil, including those in the project area (BLM and USFS 2007).

The proposed project is not expected to create unmanageable erosion issues or interfere with reclamation of the area. Topsoil stripped from areas of new construction would be retained for use during reclamation. Any areas stripped of vegetation during construction would be seeded once construction activities have ceased. All construction sites would be monitored during and after construction, and BMPs would be used to prevent erosion, minimize runoff and loss of sediment, and ensure soil stabilization. The implementation of BMPs by the operator would reduce project effects and maintain negligible levels of erosion; therefore, no significant adverse impacts to soil resources would be anticipated.

To minimize soil impacts during construction and operation activities, Enerplus would minimize disturbance areas and implement appropriate mitigation measures. To the extent possible, grading would be conducted in such a way as to limit soil disturbance and conserve existing vegetation. Grading and clearing of vegetation would be conducted to provide adequate construction and operational staging and access to the project areas.

Enerplus has committed to the following specific protective measures that would prevent or reduce erosion potential within the project area.

- All construction would include implementation of BMPs to prevent erosion, minimize runoff and loss of sediment, and ensure soil stabilization. The project location would be inspected during construction in accordance with NPDES requirements, and monitored after construction to ensure that erosion does not occur.
- The well pads are designed to be level with reclamation completed on exposed cut and fill slopes shortly following construction.
- Excess soil after interim rehabilitation would be removed from the project area and disposed of in accordance with appropriate permits.
- The access roads would be constructed with crown and ditch to direct runoff away from gravel surfaces. Appropriately sized culverts would be installed at any

intermittent stream crossings, in accordance with BLM Gold Book standards. All disturbed areas except the road surface would be seeded and stabilized as soon as practical following construction.

- Erosion and sedimentation control measures would be implemented in the project area, such as installing culverts with energy dissipating devices at culvert outlets to avoid sedimentation in ditches, constructing water bars alongside slopes, and planting cover crops to stabilize soil following construction and before permanent seeding takes place.
- Any disturbance from operational maintenance actions along gathering pipelines would be followed by reclamation.

Other site-specific erosion control measures have been required by the BIA, and agreed to by Enerplus, as shown in Table 2.1.

3.5 WETLANDS

Generally, wetlands are areas where water saturation is the dominant factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living in the soil and on its surface (Cowardin et al. 1979). Wetlands vary widely due to regional and local differences in soils, topography, climate, hydrology, water chemistry, vegetation, and other factors. In order to be classified as a wetland under federal definition, an area must meet three requisite criteria: have a plant community dominated by hydrophytic vegetation, contain wetland hydrology, and be composed primarily of hydric soils. Each of these criteria may be met by the area containing at least one primary indicator or two secondary indicators. Wetlands that meet all three criteria may be subject to regulation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under Section 404 of the CWA (33 CFR 1251 et seq.). The regulatory status of wetlands and other potential waters of the U.S. under the CWA is determined by the USACE and EPA.

3.5.1 Potential Impacts on Wetlands

Wetland types are classified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), which maintains the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) database. The NWI is a general database that identifies wetland areas and categorizes them based primarily on aerial imagery interpretation. NWI developed its wetland classification system using Cowardin et al.'s (1979) classification of wetland and deepwater habitats. Common wetland types found in McKenzie County are discussed in the following subsections.

3.5.1.1 Palustrine Freshwater Emergent

Palustrine freshwater emergent (PEM) wetlands are characterized by erect, rooted, herbaceous aquatic plants, excluding mosses and lichens (Cowardin et al. 1979). These wetlands are usually dominated by perennial plants, which are present for most of the growing season. Agricultural activities such as hay production and livestock grazing are common in these wetland types. Dominant species may include meadow foxtail (*Alopecurus pratensis*), obligate or facultative wet sedges (*Carex* spp.), scratchgrass (*Muhlenbergia asperifolia*),

cattails (*Typha* spp.), bluegrasses (*Poa* spp.), reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), and bulrushes (*Scirpus* spp.).

3.5.1.2 Palustrine Freshwater Forested

The palustrine freshwater forested wetland class is characterized by woody vegetation that is at least 19 feet tall with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of greater than 3 inches and is found along hydrologic features such as rivers and streams in mountainous areas that support distinct plant compositions that are dependent on saturated soils (Cowardin et al. 1979). However, the USACE considers the tree stratum to contain woody plants exhibiting a DBH of greater than or equal to 3 inches, regardless of height (USACE 2010). Forested wetlands normally possess an overstory of trees, an understory of young trees or shrubs, and a herbaceous layer.

3.5.1.3 Palustrine Freshwater Scrub/Shrub

The palustrine freshwater scrub/shrub wetland class is typically dominated by woody vegetation less than 20 feet tall, such as shrubs, saplings, or small and stunted trees. Dominant trees and shrubs in this type of wetland habitat include cottonwoods (*Populus* sp.), willows (*Salix* spp.), tamarisk (*Tamarix* sp.), western snowberry (*Symphoricarpos occidentalis*), black hawthorn (*Crataegus douglasii*), and boxelder (*Acer negundo*). Other herbaceous species include redtop (*Agrostis alba*), Baltic rush (*Juncus balticus*), and sedges (Cowardin et al. 1979). The USACE considers the sapling/shrub stratum to contain woody-stemmed plants with a DBH of less than 3 inches (USACE 2010). This wetland class may be a successional stage leading to forested wetland or it may be a relatively stable community.

3.5.1.4 Freshwater Pond

The freshwater pond wetland class contains both natural surface impoundments and anthropogenic areas (i.e., stock ponds and other excavated areas) that maintain surface water year-round except in times of drought. Even in times of drought, the water table may remain at or very near the surface (Cowardin et al. 1979). Freshwater ponds usually have more than 30% vegetation cover of plants growing on or below the water's surface for most of the growing season. The low vegetation cover is often due to relatively deep (more than 0.5 meter) and turbid water that inhibits a higher cover of emergent or submerged plants. As water depth increases to about 0.5 meter, emergents like cattails, sedges, and bulrushes become sparse and submerged plants, including waterweeds (*Elodea* spp.) and pondweeds (*Potamogeton* spp.), become more abundant.

3.5.1.5 Lacustrine Limnetic

Lacustrine limnetic wetlands are large, deepwater habitats situated in topographic depressions or damned river channels that lack trees, shrubs, persistent emergents, and emergent mosses or lichens with greater than 30% areal coverage (USACE 2010). The total area of the wetland must exceed 20 acres to be classified as lacustrine limnetic. This wetland class is associated with open water bodies such as lakes, reservoirs, and impounded rivers.

According to the USFWS NWI database, 37 PEM wetlands are located within 0.5 mile of the proposed project areas, as summarized in Table 3.8 and illustrated in Figures 3.8 and 3.9. The proposed well pad in the NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, is located within 0.06 mile from the nearest PEM wetland. The proposed well pad in the NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N,

R95W, is located within 0.55 mile from the nearest palustrine aquatic bed wetland. NWI maps maintained by the USFWS do not identify any wetlands within the proposed well pad or access road areas that would be filled or disturbed by the proposed project (USFWS 2011). However, indirect impacts to wetlands could occur through site erosion and subsequent sedimentation of nearby wetland areas.

In order to prevent any downstream impacts to Lake Sakakawea, and to prevent any indirect effects to wetlands that could result from construction, drilling, or production activities, Enerplus would employ standard BMPs and other site-specific erosion control measures, as summarized in Table 2.1.

Table 3.8. Wetland Types within 0.5 Mile of the Project Area.

| Proposed Well Pad and Location | Nearest Wetland (miles) (NWI type) | Number of PEM Wetlands within 0.5 Mile | Other Wetlands within 0.5 Mile |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF | 0.06 (PEM) | 37 | 0 |
| NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF | 0.55 (PAB) | 0 | 0 |

NWI = National Wetlands Inventory

PAB = palustrine aquatic bed

PEM = palustrine freshwater emergent




Figure 3.8. NWI-identified wetlands within 0.5 mile of the proposed project area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W.




Figure 3.9. NWI-identified wetlands within 0.5 mile of the proposed project area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W.

3.6 VEGETATION AND INVASIVE SPECIES

3.6.1 Vegetation Data

The proposed project areas occur in the Missouri Plateau ecoregion (Missouri Slope), which is a western mixed-grass and short-grass prairie ecosystem (Bryce et al. 1998). Native grasses common to the area include big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*), little bluestem (*Schizachyrium scoparium*), blue grama (*Bouteloua gracilis*), side-oats grama (*Bouteloua curtipendula*), green needlegrass (*Nassella viridula*), and western wheatgrass (*Pascopyrum smithii*). Common wetland vegetation in the region includes various sedge species, prairie cordgrass (*Spartina pectinata*), bulrush, and cattails. Common plant species found in woody draws, coulees, and drainages include chokecherry (*Prunus virginiana*), silver buffaloberry (*Shepherdia argentea*), and western snowberry.

3.6.1.1 NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF

This well pad and access road would occur within native prairie habitat and an agricultural wheat field. Vegetation noted at the project area includes common yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*), ragweed (*Ambrosia* spp.), fringed sagewort (*Artemisia frigida*), horseweed (*Conyza* spp.), dandelion (*Taraxacum* spp.), alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*), yellow sweetclover (*Melilotus officinalis*), crested wheatgrass (*Agropyron cristatum*), little bluestem, smooth brome (*Bromus inermis*), and Canada thistle (*Cirsium arvense*) (Figures 3.10 and 3.11).



Figure 3.10. Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, facing northeast. Photo taken May 7, 2012.



Figure 3.11. Vegetation in the access road area in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, facing north. Photo taken May 7, 2012.

3.6.1.2 NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF

This well pad and access road would occur within upland native prairie habitat. Vegetation noted at the project area includes purple coneflower (*Echinacea angustifolia*), Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*), little bluestem, common blanketflower (*Gaillardia aristata*), western snowberry, prairie rose (*Rosa arkansana*), blue grama, western poison ivy (*Toxicodendron rydbergii*), large Indian breadroot (*Pediomelum esculentum*), prairie junegrass (*Koeleria macrantha*), wavyleaf thistle (*Cirsium undulatum*), stiff goldenrod (*Oligoneuron rigidum*), yellow salsify (*Tragopogon dubius*), cudweed sagewort (*Artemisia ludoviciana*), upright prairie coneflower (*Artemisia ludoviciana*), fringed sagewort, common yarrow, and alfalfa (Figures 3.12 and 3.13).




Figure 3.12. Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, facing east. Photo taken June 11, 2012.



Figure 3.13. Vegetation in the well pad area in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W, facing west. Photo taken June 11, 2012.

3.6.2 Threatened and Endangered Plant Species

No plant species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (16 USC 1541 et seq.) are located in McKenzie County (USFWS 2012).

3.6.3 Noxious Weeds

“Noxious weed” is a general term used to describe plant species that are not native to a given area, spread rapidly, and have adverse ecological and economic impacts. These species may

have high reproduction rates and are usually adapted to occupy a diverse range of habitats otherwise occupied by native species. These species may subsequently out-compete native plant species for resources, causing a reduction in native plant populations.

Noxious weeds have the potential to detrimentally affect public health, ecological stability, and agricultural practices. North Dakota Century Code (Chapter 63-01.1) and the North Dakota Department of Agriculture (NDDA) recognize 11 species as noxious, as shown in Table 3.9 (NDDA 2012). Each county has the authority to add additional species to their list of noxious weeds. McKenzie County added five additional species to its noxious weed list. In 2009, seven state noxious weed species were found on 63,703 acres in McKenzie County (NDDA 2012).

During the natural resource surveys, Canada thistle was found on the proposed well pad in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W. Enerplus would implement standard noxious weed control BMPs to either remove the Canada thistle or control the populations to prevent further growth.

Table 3.9. Recognized Noxious Weed Occupied Areas in McKenzie County, North Dakota.

| Common Name | Scientific Name | Acres |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| State Noxious Weeds | | |
| absinth wormwood | <i>Artemisia absinthium</i> | 15 |
| Canada thistle | <i>Cirsium arvense</i> | 34,933 |
| diffuse knapweed | <i>Centaurea diffusa</i> | 1 |
| leafy spurge | <i>Euphorbia esula</i> | 26,348 |
| musk thistle | <i>Carduus nutans</i> | 0 |
| purple loosestrife | <i>Lythrum salicaria</i> | 0 |
| Russian knapweed | <i>Acroptilon repens</i> | 0 |
| spotted knapweed | <i>Centaurea stoebe</i> | 5 |
| yellow toadflax | <i>Linaria vulgaris</i> | 0 |
| dalmatian toadflax | <i>Linaria dalmatica</i> | 1 |
| salt cedar | <i>Tamarix ramosissima</i> | 2,400 |
| Additional Noxious Weeds | | |
| black henbane | <i>Hyoscyamus niger</i> | 0 |
| common burdock | <i>Arctium minus</i> | 0 |
| houndstongue | <i>Cynoglossum officinale</i> | 0 |
| halogeton | <i>Halogeton glomeratus</i> | 0 |
| baby's breath | <i>Gypsophila muralis</i> | 0 |

Source: NDDA 2012

3.6.4 Potential Impacts on Vegetation and Noxious Weeds

The Proposed Action would result in 19.84 acres of temporary disturbance and 8.32 acres of long-term loss of the native grassland vegetation and agricultural lands described above. The potential disturbance for each project component is summarized in Table 2.1.

In addition to the removal of native grasslands, removal of existing vegetation may facilitate the spread of invasive species. The APD and this EA require the operator to control noxious weeds throughout the project area. If a noxious weed community is found, it would be eradicated unless the community is too large, in which case it would be controlled or contained to prevent further growth. The services of a qualified weed control contractor would be used.

Surface disturbance and vehicular traffic would not take place outside approved ROWs for the well pads. Areas that are stripped of topsoil must be seeded and reclaimed at the earliest opportunity. Additionally, certified weed-free straw and seed must be used for all construction, seeding, and reclamation efforts. Prompt and appropriate construction, operation, and reclamation are expected to maintain minimal levels of adverse impacts to vegetation and would reduce the potential establishment of invasive vegetation species.

Rapid reclamation and the implementation of BMPs would minimize any long-term loss of soil and degradation of vegetation resources in the project area. Construction of the proposed well pads and the access roads would result in long-term disturbance of vegetation, since these facilities would only be partially reclaimed, and would be in continuous use for the life of the project. The loss of 8.32 acres would be located in T149N, R95W and T152N, R94W. With implementation of BMPs and noxious weed management guidelines, the proposed project would result in negligible levels of vegetation disturbance and would not result in significant adverse impacts to vegetation resources.

Efforts to reduce the spread of noxious weeds would be made during the project construction and maintenance processes. The following guidelines would be followed during construction, reclamation, and maintenance stages of the project to control the spread of noxious weeds.

- Construction equipment, materials, and vehicles would be stored at construction sites or at specified construction yards.
- All personal vehicles, sanitary facilities, and staging areas would be confined to a limited number of specified locations to decrease chances of incidental disturbance and spread of weeds.
- In areas with existing noxious weed infestations, vegetation, soils, and trench spoil material would be stockpiled adjacent to the removal point and, following construction, would be returned to its original locations to prevent spreading.
- Prompt re-establishment of the desired vegetation in disturbed areas would be required. Seeding would occur during the frost-free periods after construction. Certified “noxious weed-free” seed would be used on all areas to be seeded.

3.7 WILDLIFE AND HABITAT

SWCA biologists conducted natural resource surveys for general wildlife and plants, raptor nests and habitats, and habitat assessments for threatened and endangered species on September 28, 2011, and May 7 and June 11, 2012. No eagles or other raptors or raptor nests were observed within a 0.5-mile buffer around the proposed project components during the

surveys. The North Dakota Game and Fish Department golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*) nest database was checked for known nests near the project areas. No documented golden eagle nests occur within 0.5 mile of the proposed project components (North Dakota Game and Fish Department 2010). The closest known nest (Nest ID GE031) occurs approximately 3.21 miles from the project area, in Dunn County. A sighting was recorded for this nest in 2006; the nest status was classified as unoccupied. The North Dakota Natural Heritage Program database was also checked for sensitive species within 0.5 mile of the project areas. No sensitive species occur within the 0.5-mile buffer (North Dakota Parks and Recreation 2012).

3.7.1 General Wildlife Species Occurrence and Habitat

Several species common to the northern Great Plains include, but are not limited to, mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), American badger (*Taxidea taxus*), eastern spotted skunk (*Spilogale putoris*), and grassland songbirds such as western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*) and loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*).

3.7.1.1 NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF

No threatened and endangered species habitat was observed. Potential habitat for Dakota skipper (*Hesperia dacotae*) was observed. Raptor nesting habitat was not observed in the project area during the natural resource survey. Nesting habitat for eagles is not present within 0.5 mile of the well pad and access road. Migratory bird nesting habitat is present in the project area. An Eastern meadowlark (*Sturnella magna*) and red-winged blackbird (*Agelaius phoeniceus*) were observed during the wildlife survey.

3.7.1.2 NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF

No threatened and endangered species habitat was observed. Potential habitat for Dakota skipper was observed. Raptor nesting habitat was not observed in the project area during the natural resource survey. Nesting habitat for eagles is not present within 0.5 mile of the well pad. Migratory bird nesting habitat is present in the project area. A field sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*), tree swallow (*Tachycineta bicolor*), clay-colored sparrow (*Spizella pallida*), American robin (*Turdus migratorius*), and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) were observed during the wildlife survey.

3.7.2 Threatened and Endangered Species Occurrence and Habitat

Six wildlife species that may exist in McKenzie County (USFWS 2012) are listed as threatened or endangered under the ESA (16 USC 1531 et seq.). According to the USFWS, listed species in McKenzie County include the gray wolf (*Canis lupus*), black-footed ferret (*Mustela nigripes*), whooping crane (*Grus americana*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and its Designated Critical Habitat, interior least tern (*Sterna antillarum*), and pallid sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus albus*), as well as two federal candidate species, the Dakota skipper and the Sprague's pipit (*Anthus spragueii*). In addition to the ESA, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 USC 668–668d, 54 Sta. 250) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (916 USC 703–711) protect nesting migratory bird species. The listed species and their federal status are provided in Table 3.10.

No listed threatened or endangered species or their designated critical habitats were observed within the project area. Potentially suitable habitat for Dakota skipper does occur within the project area. Eagle nesting habitat does not occur within 0.5 mile of the project area.

3.7.3 Potential Impacts to Wildlife

SWCA wildlife biologists have evaluated the status, life history, and potential effects of the Proposed Action on each of the listed species. The potential effects of the project on these species is described in detail in Appendix A, and summarized in Table 3.10.

Minor impacts to wildlife species and their habitats could result from the construction of the well pads and new access roads, increased vehicular traffic density, drilling activities, and long-term disturbances during commercial production. Ground clearing may impact habitat for small birds, small mammals, and other wildlife species. Fragmentation of native prairie habitat can detrimentally affect grouse species; however, due to the ratio of each project area to the total landscape area, the overall disturbance would be negligible. The proposed project may affect raptor and migratory bird species through direct mortality, habitat degradation, and/or displacement of individual birds.

Indirect effects of the project on listed species could result from human disturbance and increases in vehicular traffic during drilling and commercial production, as well as indirectly from habitat degradation, sedimentation, or accidental release of drilling fluids or hazardous materials from the drilling, construction, or operation of the wells.

Several precautions that may limit or reduce the possible impact to all wildlife species include locating well pads over areas with existing disturbances, where possible; using avian-safe coverings on the cuttings pits and reclaiming the pits immediately after wells are completed; removing any oil found in pits and ponds; installing covers under drip buckets and spigots; and conducting interim reclamation of at least half the disturbed area.

Reclamation would begin without delay if a well is determined to be unproductive, or upon completion of commercial production. Any wildlife species inhabiting the project area are likely to adapt to changing conditions and continue to persist without adverse impacts.

With implementation of the protective measures identified above, in Table 3.10, in Section 2.2.10, Construction Details at Individual Sites, and in Section 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring, the proposed project is unlikely to adversely affect wildlife species.

Table 3.10. Summary of Potential Effects to Threatened and Endangered Species.

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|--|------------|--|---|---|
| Black-footed Ferret (<i>Mustela nigripes</i>) | Endangered | Species is presumed extirpated from North Dakota. | None. | No Effect |
| Gray Wolf (<i>Canis lupus</i>) | Endangered | Nearest known gray wolf populations exist in Minnesota, Canada, Montana, and Wyoming. | None. | No Effect |
| Whooping Crane (<i>Grus americana</i>) | Endangered | Birds may occasionally stopover during migration due to the presence of suitable foraging habitat near the project area. | Underground utility lines would be utilized in the proposed project area. If whooping cranes are sighted within 1 mile of the project area, drilling or construction activity would cease and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) would be notified. Cuttings pits would include avian-safe coverings and be reclaimed immediately after wells are completed. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|--|------------|---|---|---|
| Piping Plover (<i>Charadrius melodus</i>) | Threatened | Birds are unlikely to be present due to lack of suitable foraging or nesting habitat. | <p>Enerplus would implement all best management practices (BMPs), erosion control measures, and spill prevention practices required by the Clean Water Act.</p> <p>Enerplus would use a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit on the pads.</p> <p>At all locations, a 3-foot-high 12-gauge steel containment with a 24-millimeter load out liner and concrete footer would be installed under and around all tank batteries and treaters/separators. A heavy screen-covered drip barrel would be installed under the outlet. A metal access staircase would protect the dike and support flexible hoses used by tanker trucks. This system is designed to hold 110% of the capacity of the largest tank plus one day's production to prevent hazardous runoff or spills.</p> <p>An 18-inch-tall berm would be constructed at all well pad locations, as summarized in Table 2.1.</p> <p>A diversion ditch would be constructed, as needed, at well pad locations to reduce sediment loss and transportation from the well pads, as summarized in Table 2.1.</p> <p>Sediment control devices would be implemented as needed to prevent or reduce sediment transport off the well pad locations.</p> <p>All locations would comply with BIA's conditions of approval.</p> <p>Cuttings pits would include avian-safe coverings and be reclaimed immediately after wells are completed.</p> <p>Interior floors of the drilling pads would be sloped away from drainage ways. Cuttings pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick.</p> | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| Designated Critical Habitat for Piping Plover | Designated Critical Habitat | Critical Habitat occurs approximately 11.03 river miles from the project area, on the shoreline and islands of Lake Sakakawea. | See piping plover protective measures. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |
| Interior Least Tern (<i>Sterna antillarum</i>) | Endangered | The nearest suitable nesting and foraging habitat occurs on the shoreline and islands of Lake Sakakawea, approximately 11.03 river miles from the proposed well pads and access roads. Migrating or foraging interior least terns may transition through the project area. | See piping plover protective measures. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |
| Pallid Sturgeon (<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>) | Endangered | Suitable habitat occurs in Lake Sakakawea (Missouri River), approximately 11.03 river miles from the project area. | See piping plover protective measures. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |
| Sprague's Pipit (<i>Anthus spragueii</i>) | Candidate | Habitat requirements include unfragmented native grasslands of intermediate height (4 to 12 inches) with a minimum patch size of 358 acres. | See migratory bird protective measures below. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Dakota Skipper (<i>Hesperia dactylus</i>) | Candidate | Suitable habitat was noted within the project area. However, no adverse impact is anticipated as a result of construction activities. | Utility corridors would be co-located in road rights-of-way. Multiple wells would be constructed on each well pad. Suitable habitat would be re-established by performing interim reclamation on disturbed areas not needed for operations after construction and drilling. Final reclamation would occur on all disturbed areas either in the short term if the well is commercially unproductive or later upon final abandonment of commercial operations. | May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect |
| Other Federally Protected Species | | | | |
| Bald Eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>) | Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA) and Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) | No known nests occur within 0.5 mile of the project area. Raptor habitat survey was conducted. No raptor nests were observed within the project area. Eagle nesting habitat does not occur within 0.5 mile of the project area. | Maintain a minimum 0.5-mile buffer around all known or newly discovered active bald and golden eagle nests. | No Adverse Effects Anticipated |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|--|----------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Golden Eagle (<i>Aquila chrysaetos</i>) | BGEPA and MBTA | No known nests occur within 0.5 mile of the project area. The closest known nest is 3.21 miles southeast of well locations. Raptor habitat survey was conducted. No raptor nests were observed within the project area. Eagle nesting habitat does not occur within 0.5 mile of the project area. Golden eagles may occasionally visit the project area. | See bald eagle protective measures. | No Adverse Effects Anticipated |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Species | ESA Status | Habitat Suitability or Known Occurrence | Operator-Committed Measures | Effects Determination |
|-----------------|------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Migratory Birds | MBTA | Suitable habitat for nesting migratory grassland birds occurs in the project area. | <p>At all project locations, migratory bird protective measures would be implemented, as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule construction for late summer or fall/early winter so as not to disrupt waterfowl or other migratory birds during the breeding season (February 1–July 15). • If the construction window in the above item cannot be honored, degrade migratory bird habitat at the project site outside of the breeding season (July 16–January 31) by mowing and/or clearing and grubbing to discourage nesting, and maintain the habitat in a degraded state until construction is completed. • If construction will occur within the migratory bird nesting season and habitat degradation has not been accomplished, conduct surveys at the well pad and access road areas for migratory birds and their active nests (nests containing eggs or young) within 5 days of commencement of construction activities. If active nests are found during surveys, contact the USFWS and BIA with a proposal for maintaining adequate buffers around the nest or realigning the work to prevent the take of migratory birds. • Cuttings pits would include avian-safe coverings and be reclaimed immediately after wells are completed. | No Adverse Effects Anticipated |

3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic properties, or cultural resources, on federal or tribal lands are protected by many laws, regulations, and agreements. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 470 et seq.) requires, for any federal, federally assisted, or federally licensed undertaking, that the federal agency take into account the effect of that undertaking on any district, site, building, structure or object that is included in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) before the expenditure of any federal funds or the issuance of any federal license. Cultural resources is a broad term encompassing sites, objects, or practices of archaeological, historical, cultural, and religious significance. Eligibility criteria (36 CFR 60.6) include association with important events or people in our history, distinctive construction or artistic characteristics, and either a record of yielding or a potential to yield information important in prehistory or history. In practice, properties are generally not eligible for listing on the NRHP if they lack diagnostic artifacts, subsurface remains, or structural features, but those considered eligible are treated as though they were listed on the NRHP even when no formal nomination has been filed. This process of taking into account an undertaking's effect on historic properties is known as "Section 106 review," or more commonly as a cultural resource inventory.

The area of potential effect of any federal undertaking must also be evaluated for significance to Native Americans from a cultural and religious standpoint. Sites and practices may be eligible for protection under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 USC 1996). Sacred sites may be identified by a tribe or an authoritative individual (Executive Order 13007). Special protections are afforded to human remains, funerary objects, and objects of cultural patrimony under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC 3001 et seq.).

Whatever the nature of the cultural resource addressed by a particular statute or tradition, implementing procedures invariably include consultation requirements at various stages of a federal undertaking. The MHA Nation has designated a Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) by Tribal Council resolution, whose office and functions are certified by the National Park Service. The THPO operates with the same authority exercised in most of the rest of North Dakota by the State Historic Preservation Officer. Thus, BIA consults and corresponds with the THPO regarding cultural resources on all projects proposed within the exterior boundaries of the Reservation.

3.8.1 Cultural Resource Inventories

Cultural resource inventories of these well pads and access roads were conducted by personnel of SWCA Environmental Consultants, using an intensive pedestrian methodology. For the Sapphire 148-95-3B-10H/Ruby 148-95-3B-10HTF/Rod 149-95-36D-25H/Reel 149-95-36D-25HTF project approximately 20.1 acres were inventoried between May 9 and June 11, 2012 (Schleicher and Leroy 2012). One previously recorded archaeological site was evaluated via 154 shovel test probes and was found to possess the quality of integrity and meet at least one of the criteria (36 CFR 60.6) so as to be **eligible** for inclusion on the National Register. As the lead federal agency, and as provided for in 36 CFR 800.5, on the basis of the information provided, BIA reached a determination of **no adverse effect** for this

undertaking, as the project has been moved so as to avoid the archaeological site. This determination was communicated to the THPO on July 16, 2012; however, the THPO did not respond within the allotted 30 day comment period. For the Racer 152-94-19B/Garter 152-94-19BHTF project approximately 26.74 acres were inventoried on May 7, 2012 (Schleicher 2012). No historic properties were located that appear to possess the quality of integrity and meet at least one of the criteria (36 CFR 60.6) for inclusion on the National Register. On the basis of the information provided, BIA reached a determination of **no historic properties** affected for this undertaking. This determination was communicated to the THPO on July 16, 2012; however, the THPO did not respond within the allotted 30 day comment period.

3.8.2 Potential Impacts to Cultural Resources

If cultural resources are discovered during construction or operation, the operator shall immediately stop work, secure the affected site, and notify the BIA and the THPO. Unexpected or inadvertent discoveries of cultural resources or human remains trigger mandatory federal procedures that include work stoppage and BIA consultation with all appropriate parties. Following any such discovery, operations would not resume without written authorization from the BIA. Project personnel are prohibited from collecting any artifacts or disturbing cultural resources in the area under any circumstance. Individuals outside the ROW are trespassing. No laws, regulations, or other requirements have been waived; no compensatory mitigation measures are required.

3.9 TRANSPORTATION

3.9.1 Federal and North Dakota State Transportation Links

Transportation in the project area is predominantly by private automobiles and commercial trucks on established roads. The transportation study area includes all highways and roads that traverse the Reservation, as well as those providing access to tribal lands. Major federal highways surrounding the project area include U.S. Highway 2, which is an east/west route to the north of the Reservation; U.S. Highway 83, a north/south route to the east of the Reservation; and U.S. Highway 85, a north/south route to the west of the project area. Interstate highways south of the project area provide access to Bismarck and other interstate transportation links. Federal highways outside of the Reservation boundaries are built and maintained through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and North Dakota Department of Transportation (NDDOT) funding and guidelines.

The Reservation is bisected by North Dakota state and county roads, which link the area with the goods, services, and markets in North Dakota and beyond, as shown in Figure 3.14. State Highway 22 traverses the Reservation from north to south, passing west of Mandaree. State Highway 23 is an east/west route passing through New Town, North Dakota. State Highway 200 is an east/west route traversing the area south of the Little Missouri River. State Highway 73 provides access to the Reservation from the west, in the area south of Lake Sakakawea, and State Highway 1804 intersects State Highway 23 near New Town, providing access from the north.

State Highway 22 provides the primary transportation link to the project area, which is approximately 14 miles north or 7 miles south of the intersection of State Highway 22 and

State Highway 73, northwest of Mandaree. In addition to providing access to the town of Mandaree, State Highway 22 is designated by North Dakota Parks and Recreation as part of the Killdeer Mountain-Four Bears Scenic Byway, known for its scenic, cultural, and historical importance to North Dakota (North Dakota Parks and Recreation 2011a). The North Dakota Scenic Byways and Backways Program encourages all development projects within the immediate and distant viewshed of State Highway 22 to conserve the visual and aesthetic quality of the area (North Dakota Parks and Recreation 2011b).




Figure 3.14. Fort Berthold Indian Reservation major roads and highways.

3.9.2 Indian Reservation Roads Program

Approximately 2,733.5 miles of roads within the Reservation are under the jurisdiction of the BIA Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) Program (IRR 2011). These Reservation IRR roads provide access to all areas of the Reservation with paved, all-weather roads, as well as numerous non-paved improved roads that serve as access to energy exploration and development and other activities surrounding the project area (IRR 2011). Figure 3.14 provides an overview of these primary and secondary BIA roads, but does not attempt to show the many primitive roads or well pad and pipeline access roads that occur on the Reservation.

The BIA and the MHA Nation retain planning and maintenance responsibility over this roadway system on the Reservation through the IRR Program of the FHWA. The IRR Program addresses transportation needs of tribes by providing funds for planning, design, construction, and maintenance activities. The program is jointly administered by the FHWA and the BIA. The IRRs are all public roads which provide access to and within Indian reservations, Indian trust land, restricted Indian land, and Alaska native villages. IRR funds can be used for any type Title 23 transportation project providing access to or within federal or Indian lands and may be used for the state/local matching share for apportioned federal-aid highway funds (FHWA 2010).

The most recent IRR inventory for the Reservation roads was conducted in 2006. The 2006 inventory shows that the Reservation is bisected by approximately 6,600 road segments ranging in length from 0.01 mile to 15.00 miles. Approximately 284.63 miles of BIA roads consist of paved surface types, and 671.00 miles consist of improved gravel roads. The remaining roads are primitive or other unimproved road types.

3.9.3 Trends in Reservation Vehicular Traffic Volume

Table 3.11 provides summary information for 15 BIA road segments for which average daily traffic (ADT) measurements have been recorded since 1994. Some additional road segments had ADT data prior to 1994, but most likely would not reflect current conditions. Since the IRR data only provide the most recent ADT, it is not possible to determine if ADT is increasing on BIA roads.

Table 3.11. Summary of BIA Roads with ADT Data since 1994.

| Road Name | IRR Class | Surface Type | Section Length (miles) | Road Width (feet) | ADT | % Trucks | ADT Year |
|-------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-----|----------|----------|
| BIA 1 | Rural, local traffic | Gravel | 3.8 | 25 and 26 | 150 | 15 | 1994 |
| BIA 1 | Rural, local traffic | Paved >2 inches thick | 6.1 | 24 | 839 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 1 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 1.0 | 24 and 30 | 839 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 2 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 4.9 | 20 | 656 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 6 | Rural, local traffic | Paved >2 inches thick | 11.2 | 24 | 139 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 10 | Rural, local traffic | Gravel | 5.7 | 20 | 102 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 12 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 1.2 | 24 | 944 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 12 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 18.4 | 24 | 398 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA Route 1 | Rural, local traffic | Gravel | 6.5 | 24 | 100 | 5 | 2000 |
| BIA 14 | Rural, major collector | Gravel | 12.3 | 22 | 198 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 18 | Rural, major collector | Paved <2 inches thick | 8.8 | 30 | 114 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 18 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 3.0 | 28 | 114 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 22 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 2.8 | 28 | 757 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 22 | Rural, major collector | Paved >2 inches thick | 0.2 | 27 | 504 | 2 | 2006 |
| BIA 27 | Rural, local traffic | Gravel | 3.7 | 20 | 137 | 2 | 2006 |

Source: IRR 2011.

ADT = average daily traffic

BIA = Bureau of Indian Affairs

IRR = Indian Reservation Road

Table 3.12 provides ADT recorded at traffic counter stations along eight NDDOT highway segments within the Reservation for years in which such data were recorded between 2005 through 2010. No data were recorded within the Reservation by NDDOT during 2007. Traffic volumes vary greatly along the various NDDOT highways that pass through the Reservation. Some primary highways show consistent increases each year and have experienced increases in ADT and in truck ADT since 2005, as shown in Table 3.12. Increases ranging from more than 73% to 700% in passenger vehicle traffic volume were experienced on State Highways 22, 23, and 73, and County Road 8. The same highways experienced increases in truck traffic

volumes ranging from 344% to 2,500% over the same period, indicating that industrial activity, most likely the increased activity of oil and gas drilling, has had an effect on traffic within the Reservation. Some NDDOT highways, however, had limited data available and failed to show clear trends for traffic increase, or even showed a decrease in ADT for the period.

3.9.4 Trends in Traffic Safety on the Reservation

Traffic accident data were not available for BIA roads. Accident data were obtained for seven NDDOT highway sections on the Reservation from January 2008 through May 2011, as shown in Table 3.13. NDDOT statistics suggest that traffic accidents have increased on the approximately 141.6 miles of state roads within the boundaries of the Reservation from January 2008 to May 2011. In addition to trends in overall accidents and accidents involving fatalities or injuries on state highways, the incidence of accidents or injuries involving truck-tractors and two- or three-axle trucks were evaluated as indicators of safety issues from increased oil and gas activity within the Reservation.

The monthly average was determined for each measure and the percentage departure from the monthly average was calculated to assess the overall yearly relationship to the 41-month average. In general, 2008 and 2009 showed below average accident rates, injuries and fatalities, truck accidents, and truck accidents involving injuries compared with the 41-month average, while 2010 and the 5-month period of 2011 showed above average accident and injury rates, as summarized in Table 3.13. State Highways 23, 73, and 8 each experienced increased ADT and truck ADT, and also experienced above average accidents, including truck-involved traffic accidents. State Highway 22 was an exception, since traffic volumes increased but no corresponding increase in accidents occurred. State Highway 37 was also an exception to increased traffic contributing to increased accidents, since this highway segment saw a decrease in ADT and truck ADT, but experienced above average accidents, including truck-involved accidents during 2010 and 2011.

The data suggest that a combination of overall increased passenger traffic and increased truck traffic may be contributing to above average accident rates in recent years; however, it will take several additional years of data collection to establish a clear connection, and poor road repair condition, weather, and driver error may contribute to accidents as much as traffic volume.

Table 3.12. Changes in ADT along NDDOT Highways within the Reservation, 2005–2010.

| NDDOT Highway | Segment | 2005 | | 2006 | | 2008 | | 2009 | | 2010 | | % Change in Traffic | |
|---------------|---|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | | ADT | Truck ADT | ADT | Truck ADT |
| ND 22 | RP 126.5–156.05 | NA | NA | 635 | 60 | NA | NA | 1330 | 305 | 2130 | 680 | 235.4 | 1033.3 |
| | South Reservation boundary north to ND 23 (29.55 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Traffic increases |
| ND 23 | RP 35.6–80.6 | 2200 | 180 | NA | NA | 2450 | 375 | 2970 | 560 | 3810 | 800 | 73.2 | 344.4 |
| | Reservation west boundary to east boundary (45.0 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Traffic increases |
| ND 37 | RP 0.0–30.0 | 715 | 175 | NA | NA | 631 | 85 | NA | NA | NA | NA | -11.7 | -51.4 |
| | ND 23 south and Reservation east boundary (30.0 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Decreased traffic based on 2008 data |
| ND 73 | RP 7.3–11.32 | NA | NA | 200 | 30 | NA | NA | 680 | 140 | 1605 | 780 | 702.5 | 2500.0 |
| | Reservation boundary to ND 22 (4.02 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Traffic increases |
| ND 1804 | RP 247.145–248.6 | 1625 | 205 | NA | NA | 1355 | 300 | NA | NA | NA | NA | -16.6 | 46.3 |
| | Reservation west and north boundaries to ND 37 (1.455 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Mixed result based on 2008 data |
| ND 1804 | RP 192.1–213.688 | NA | NA | 235 | 70 | NA | NA | 245 | 35 | NA | NA | 4.3 | -50.0 |
| | ND 23 (New Town) to Reservation north boundary (21.588 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Mixed result based on 2009 data |
| ND 8 | RP 123.7–132.12 | NA | NA | 125 | 15 | NA | NA | 170 | 20 | NA | NA | 36.0 | 33.3 |
| | Reservation boundary north to Lake Sakakawea (8.42 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Traffic increases |
| ND 8 | RP 132.121–133.7 | 640 | 110 | NA | NA | 1440 | 490 | 1870 | 700 | 2245 | 1000 | 250.8 | 809.1 |
| | ND 23 north to Reservation boundary (1.58 miles) | | | | | | | | | | | | Traffic increases |

Source: North Dakota Department of Transportation 2011.

ADT = average daily traffic

NA = not applicable

Table 3.13. 41-month Safety Trends on NDDOT Roads within the Reservation.

| State Highway Number and Accident Breakdown | 41-month Totals | | 2008 | | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 (Jan-May) | |
|--|-----------------|---------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | Accidents | Average | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) |
| ND 22: RP 126.5-156.05 (29.55 miles) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 34 | 0.83 | 8 | -19.61 | 6 | -39.71 | 16 | 60.78 | 4 | -3.53 |
| Truck Involved | 9 | 0.22 | 2 | -24.07 | 1 | -62.04 | 5 | 89.81 | 1 | -8.89 |
| Fatality or Injury | 13 | 0.32 | 4 | 5.13 | 4 | 5.13 | 4 | 5.13 | 1 | -36.92 |
| Truck & Injury | 4 | 0.10 | 1 | -14.58 | 1 | -14.58 | 2 | 70.83 | 0 | -100.00 |
| Year Performance | | | Below Average | | Below Average | | Above Average | | Below Average | |
| ND 23: RP 35.6-80.6 (45 miles) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 117 | 2.85 | 32 | -6.55 | 27 | -21.15 | 37 | 8.05 | 21 | 47.18 |
| Truck Involved | 28 | 0.68 | 5 | -38.99 | 3 | -63.39 | 15 | 83.04 | 5 | 46.43 |
| Fatality or Injury | 41 | 1.00 | 13 | 8.33 | 13 | 8.33 | 12 | 0.00 | 3 | -40.00 |
| Truck & Injury | 11 | 0.27 | 2 | -37.88 | 3 | -6.82 | 4 | 24.24 | 2 | 49.09 |
| Year Performance | | | Below Average | | Below Average | | Above Average | | Above Average | |
| ND 37: RP 0.0-30.0 (30 miles) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 22 | 0.54 | 4 | -37.88 | 6 | -6.82 | 8 | 24.24 | 4 | 49.09 |
| Truck Involved | 12 | 0.29 | 1 | -71.53 | 2 | -43.06 | 5 | 42.36 | 4 | 173.33 |
| Fatality or Injury | 8 | 0.20 | 1 | -57.29 | 2 | -14.58 | 0 | -100.00 | 4 | 310.00 |
| Truck & Injury | 7 | 0.17 | 1 | -51.19 | 1 | -51.19 | 2 | -2.38 | 3 | 251.43 |
| Year Performance | | | Below Average | | Below Average | | Below Average | | Above Average | |
| ND 73: RP 7.3-11.32 (4.02 miles) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 6 | 0.15 | 0 | -100.00 | 2 | 13.89 | 3 | 70.83 | 1 | 36.67 |
| Truck Involved | 1 | 0.02 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 241.67 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 |
| Fatality or Injury | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 70.83 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 310.00 |
| Truck & Injury | 0 | NA | 0 | NA | 0 | NA | 0 | NA | 0 | NA |
| Year Performance | | | Below Average | | Above Average | | Below Average | | Above Average | |
| ND 1804: 2 segments (RP 247.145-248.6 [1.45 miles]; RP 192.1-213.688 [21.59 miles]) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 13 | 0.32 | 6 | 57.69 | 2 | -47.44 | 3 | -21.15 | 2 | 26.15 |
| Truck Involved | 1 | 0.02 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 241.67 | 0 | -100.00 |
| Fatality or Injury | 7 | 0.17 | 4 | 95.24 | 2 | -2.38 | 1 | -51.19 | 0 | -100.00 |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| State Highway Number and Accident Breakdown | 41-month Totals | | 2008 | | 2009 | | 2010 | | 2011 (Jan-May) | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| | Accidents | Average | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) | Accidents | Change from Average (%) |
| Truck & Injury | 1 | 0.02 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 241.67 | 0 | -100.00 |
| Year Performance | | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Above Average | Above Average | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average |
| ND 8: 2 segments (RP 123.7-132.120 [8.42 miles]; RP 132.121-133.7 [1.58 miles]) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 10 | 0.24 | 0 | -100.00 | 3 | 2.50 | 4 | 36.67 | 3 | 146.00 |
| Truck Involved | 5 | 0.12 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 2 | 36.67 | 2 | 228.00 |
| Fatality or Injury | 2 | 0.05 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 2 | 241.67 | 0 | -100.00 |
| Truck & Injury | 1 | 0.02 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 0 | -100.00 | 1 | 720.00 |
| Year Performance | | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Above Average | Above Average | Above Average | Above Average | Above Average |
| All Reservation NDDOT Roads | | | | | | | | | | |
| All Accidents | 202 | 4.93 | 50 | -15.43 | 46 | -22.19 | 71 | 20.09 | 35 | 42.08 |
| Truck Involved | 56 | 1.37 | 8 | -51.19 | 7 | -57.29 | 28 | 70.83 | 12 | 75.71 |
| Fatality or Injury | 73 | 1.78 | 22 | 2.97 | 22 | 2.97 | 19 | -11.07 | 9 | 1.10 |
| Truck & Injury | 19 | 0.46 | 4 | -28.07 | 5 | -10.09 | 9 | 61.84 | 6 | 158.95 |
| All NDDOT Roads Year Compared to Average | | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Below Average | Above Average | Above Average | Above Average | Above Average |

Source: North Dakota Department of Transportation 2011.

NA = not applicable

NDDOT = North Dakota Department of Transportation

3.9.5 Potential Impacts to Transportation

Transportation impacts could include any adverse visual changes to the near and distant viewshed of Killdeer Mountain-Four Bear Scenic Byway (State Highway 22); increased traffic volumes on primary and secondary highways, and resource and collector roads; an increased need for maintenance of existing roadways; or an increase in two-track and off-road vehicle travel. The NDDOT vehicle accident data for the Reservation do not necessarily indicate that there would be an increase in vehicle accidents and livestock/wildlife-vehicle collisions correlated with a temporary increase in ADT due to project activities. However, road surface condition and construction could be affected by the addition of many heavy loads associated with well drilling, dirt moving, and HF activities.

One proposed well pad and/or the radio tower location (located in NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W) would be visible at a distance from State Highway 22. A distant view of the facilities would not affect the visual and aesthetic character of the Killdeer Mountain-Four Bear Scenic Byway in the vicinity of Mandaree, North Dakota, since similar facilities are located nearby and are also likely to be visible from the highway. As an administrative BMP for visual resources, Enerplus has designed roads and facility sites to minimize visual impacts. Based on minimizing impacts and final reclamation measures, these facilities would not result in any long-term adverse effects on the viewshed of the Killdeer Mountain-Four Bear Scenic Byway.

Potential short-term impacts from added traffic could occur. Overall, approximately 7 months of continuous construction is anticipated to complete all components of the Proposed Action. Drilling and construction of many of the components and facilities would take place concurrently. As many as 35 construction workers may be accessing the sites during certain periods of intensive construction. Following construction, wells and pipelines would receive regularly scheduled inspection and maintenance, but would not require a regular workforce.

The proposed project would add new traffic volume to State Highways 22 and 23, as well as BIA Roads 12 (paved) and 30 (gravel), before entering the access roads that Enerplus proposes to construct, improve, and maintain. Additional traffic would include approximately 3,000 heavy truckloads over the 7-month construction period to transport drill rigs, pipe, steel, equipment, building materials, and other miscellaneous construction materials on federal, state, and BIA roads. The proposed project would increase traffic by an average of 15 to 20 heavy trucks per day, and 15 to 40 pick-up trucks per day over the 7-month construction period. This impact to transportation would be short term and local on BIA Roads 12 and 30 and State Highways 22 and 23.

3.10 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

The Proposed Action would occur in a rural area with four residences located within 1 mile of the proposed well pad project areas. The nearest home would be 0.22 mile southwest of the proposed wells in NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W.

Health and safety concerns include sour gas, natural gas, or any gas containing H₂S gas, that could be released as a result of drilling activities; hazards introduced by heavy truck traffic;

and hazardous materials used or generated during construction, drilling, and/or production activities.

H₂S is extremely toxic in concentrations above 500 ppm, but it has not been found in measurable quantities in the Bakken Formation. Before reaching the Bakken, however, drilling would penetrate the Mission Canyon Formation, which is known to contain varying concentrations of H₂S. Contingency plans submitted to the BLM comply fully with relevant portions of Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 6 to minimize potential for gas leaks during drilling. Emergency response plans protect both the drilling crew and the general public within 1 mile of a well; precautions include automated sampling and monitoring by drilling personnel stationed at each well site.

Standard mitigation measures would be applied, and because release of H₂S at dangerous concentration levels is very unlikely, no direct impacts from H₂S are anticipated with implementation of the project.

The number and frequency of tanker trips would depend on production, but Enerplus estimates approximately two trucks per day during the initial production period. Trucks for normal production operations would use the existing and proposed access roads. Produced water would be transported to an approved disposal site. All traffic would be confined to approved routes and conform to established load restrictions and speed limits for state and BIA roadways and haul permits would be acquired as appropriate.

The EPA specifies chemical reporting requirements under Title III of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), as amended. No chemicals subject to reporting under SARA Title III (hazardous materials) in an amount greater than 10,000 pounds would be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of annually in association with the Proposed Action. Furthermore, no extremely hazardous substances, as defined in 40 CFR 355, in threshold planning quantities would be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of in association with the Proposed Action. All operations, including flaring, would conform to instructions from BIA fire management staff.

A temporary, lined dry cuttings pit would be constructed within the disturbed areas for the well pads and constructed so as not to leak, break, or allow discharge, and in a way that minimizes the accumulation of precipitation runoff into the pit.

Spills of oil, produced water, or other produced fluids would be cleaned up and disposed of in accordance with appropriate regulations. Sewage would be contained in a portable chemical toilet during drilling. All trash would be stored in a trash cage and hauled to an appropriate landfill during and after drilling and completion operations.

3.10.1 Potential Impacts to Public Health and Safety

With the implementation of the described reporting and management of hazardous materials, no adverse impacts to public health and safety are anticipated as a result of the proposed new wells. Other potential adverse impacts to any nearby residents from construction would be largely temporary. Noise, fugitive dust, and traffic hazards would be present for about 210 days during construction, drilling, and well completion as equipment and vehicles move on

and off the site, and then diminish sharply during production operations. If a well proved productive, one small pumper truck would visit the well once a day to check the pump. Bakken and Three Forks wells typically produce both oil and water at a high rate initially. Gas would be flared initially and intermittently, while oil and produced water would be stored on the well pads in tanks and then hauled out by tankers until the well could be connected to gathering pipelines. Up to three 400-barrel oil tanks and one 400-barrel water tank would be located on each pad inside a 3-foot-high 12-gauge steel containment structure with a 24-millimeter load out liner and concrete footer. This structure would be designed to hold 110% of the capacity of the largest tank plus one day's production.

3.11 SOCIOECONOMICS

This section discusses community characteristics such as population, housing, demographics, employment, and economic trends within the analysis area. Also included are data relating to the State of North Dakota and the United States, which provide a comparative discussion when compared to the analysis area. Information in this section was obtained from various sources including, but not limited to, the U.S. Census Bureau, the U.S. Bureau of Economics, and the North Dakota State Government.

3.11.1 Socioeconomic Analysis Area

The scope of analysis for social and economic resources includes a discussion of current social and economic data relevant to the project area and surrounding communities of the Reservation and McKenzie, Dunn, McLean, and Mountrail Counties, North Dakota. These counties were chosen for analysis because their proximity to the proposed well locations and overlap with the Reservation could result in socioeconomic impacts. These communities are collectively referred to as the analysis area.

3.11.2 Population and Demographic Trends

Historic and current population counts for the analysis area, compared to the state, are provided below in Table 3.14. The state population showed little change between the previous two census counts (1990–2000); however, in 2010 the state population increased by 4.7% to 659,858 (Economic Profile System [EPS] 2012). Populations in McKenzie and Mountrail Counties have increased slightly from 2000 to 2010 while McLean and Dunn Counties had a rate of decline of -4.8% and -3.4%, respectively (EPS 2012). These declines can be attributed to more people moving to metropolitan areas, which are perceived as offering more employment opportunities. Population on the Reservation increased approximately 4.2% between 2000 and 2010 (EPS 2012). While Native Americans are the predominant group on the Reservation, they are considered the minority in all other areas of North Dakota.

As presented in Table 3.14, population growth on the Reservation (4.2% between 2000 and 2010) is consistent with the overall growth in the state of North Dakota (4.7%).

Table 3.14. Population and Demographic Trends in the Analysis Area.

| County or Reservation | Population in 2010 | % of State Population | % Change Between 1990–2000 | % Change Between 2000–2010 | Predominant Group in 2010 (%) | Predominant Minority in 2010 (Percent of Total Minority Population) |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Dunn | 3,477 | 0.53 | -10.1 | -3.4 | Caucasian (85.2) | American Indian (9.4%) |
| McKenzie | 6,004 | 0.91 | -10.1 | 4.7 | Caucasian (76.0) | American Indian (21.4%) |
| McLean | 8,861 | 1.34 | -11.0 | -4.8 | Caucasian (91.9) | American Indian (7.0%) |
| Mountrail | 7,228 | 1.10 | -5.6 | 9.0 | Caucasian (66.5) | American Indian (28.4%) |
| Fort Berthold Indian Reservation | 6,162 | 0.93 | 178.0 ¹ | 4.2 | American Indian (63.0) | American Indian (63.0) |
| Statewide | 659,858 | 100.00 | 0.5 | 4.7 | Caucasian (74.0) | Black or African American (12.5%) |

Source: EPS 2012, U.S. Census Bureau 2011a.

¹ Reflects percent change between 1991 and 2001 (BIA 2001).

3.11.3 Employment

The economy in the state of North Dakota, including the Reservation and four counties in the analysis area, has historically depended on agriculture, including forestry, fishing and hunting, and grazing and farming. In 2010, the “education, health care, and social assistance” sector represented 24.2% of industry employment in the state, followed by retail trade (12.1%) (EPS 2012). Although the “agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining” sector only represented 8.6% of employment in North Dakota, the sector has a significant role in the regional economies of Dunn, McKenzie, McLean, and Mountrail Counties, as well as the Reservation; this sector accounted for 29.1% of employment in Dunn County, 25.4% in McKenzie County, 21.5% in McLean County, 19.8% in Mountrail County, and 13.3% of employment on the Reservation (EPS 2012). The “education, health care and social assistance” sector accounted for 20.5% of employment in Dunn County, 20.7% in McKenzie County, 26.0% in McLean County, 20.8% in Mountrail County, and 24.9% of employment on the Reservation (EPS 2012). Retail trade did not represent a significant amount of employment in the analysis area in 2010 or on the Reservation; however, energy development and extraction, power generation, and services related to these activities have become increasingly important over the last several years and many service sector jobs are directly and indirectly associated with oil and gas development.

In 2010, total employment in the state of North Dakota was 352,012 (Table 3.15). In 2010, the statewide unemployment rate was 3.6% of the workforce (Table 3.15). This is the lowest

unemployment rate in the nation (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011a). All counties in the analysis area experienced a decrease in unemployment between 2005 and 2010 (Table 3.15).

Table 3.15. 2010 Total Employment and Unemployment Rates.

| Location | Total Employment | Unemployment Rate | Change in Unemployment Rate (2005–2010) |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|---|
| United States | 141,833,331 | 7.9% | +4.3% |
| North Dakota | 352,012 | 3.6% | +0.4% |
| Dunn County | 1,854 | 3.6% | -0.1% |
| McKenzie County | 2,964 | 4.0% | -1.1% |
| McLean County | 4,510 | 2.6% | -1.2% |
| Mountrail County | 3,740 | 5.2% | -3.6% |
| Fort Berthold Indian Reservation | 2,618 | 10.4% | N/A |

Sources: Bureau of Labor Statistics 2011a, 2011b; EPS 2012; U.S. Census Bureau 2010; U.S. Census Bureau 2005–2010.

In 2010, 4,411 residents of the Reservation constituted the total available workforce (over 16 years old). Unemployment on the Reservation was the highest of geographies in the analysis area at 10.4% (Table 3.15).

Residents of the Reservation are employed in similar ventures as those outside the Reservation (see discussion above for employment by industry). Typical employment includes ranching, farming, tribal government, tribal enterprises, schools, federal agencies, and recently, employment related to conventional energy development. The MHA Nation’s Four Bears Casino and Lodge, located 4 miles west of New Town, employs approximately 320 people, of which 90% are tribal members (Fort Berthold Housing Authority 2008).

The Fort Berthold Community College, which is tribally chartered to meet the higher education needs of the people of the MHA Nation, had 11 full-time members and 25 adjunct members in academic year 2006–2007. Approximately 73% of the full-time faculty members are of American Indian/Alaska Native descent, approximately 88% of which are enrolled members of the MHA Nation. Additionally, 65% of the part-time faculty members are of American Indian/Alaska Native descent and all (100%) are tribal members.

3.11.4 Income

Per capita income is often used as a measure of economic performance, but it should be used with changes in earnings for a realistic picture of economic health. Since total personal income includes income from 401(k) plans and other non-labor income sources like transfer payments, dividends, and rent, it is possible for per capita income to rise even if the average wage per job declines over time. The North American Industry Classification System is the standard used by federal statistical agencies in classifying business establishments for the purpose of collecting, analyzing, and publishing statistical data related to the U.S. business

economy. Per capita income, median household income, and poverty rates for the analysis area and North Dakota are presented in Table 3.16.

Table 3.16. Income and Poverty in Analysis Area.

| Unit of Analysis | Per Capita Income ¹ (2000) | Per Capita Income ² (2010) | Median Household Income ² (2010) | Percent of all People in Poverty ² (2010) |
|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Dunn County | \$21,031 | \$24,832 | \$48,707 | 11.2% |
| McKenzie County | \$22,269 | \$27,605 | \$48,480 | 12.8% |
| McLean County | \$23,125 | \$27,029 | \$52,922 | 10.3% |
| Mountrail County | \$23,045 | \$25,762 | \$48,480 | 12.4% |
| Fort Berthold Indian Reservation | \$8,855 | \$18,059 | \$41,658 | N/A |
| North Dakota | \$25,624 | \$25,803 | \$46,781 | 11.7% |

¹ U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis 2011a, 2011b.

² U.S. Census Bureau 2010.

In 2010, the per capita income for the state was \$25,803, compared to \$24,832 for Dunn County, \$27,605 for McKenzie County, \$27,029 for McLean County, \$25,762 for Mountrail County, and \$18,059 for the Reservation (see Table 3.16). From 2000 to 2010, per capita income changes in the state were relatively flat with a 0.7% increase; Dunn County per capita income increased by 18.1%, 24.0% for McKenzie County, 16.9% for McLean County, and 11.8% for Mountrail County. Per capita income on the Reservation increased 104% between 1999 and the 2010 Census, however was 30% to 35% lower than the four counties in the analysis area and the state.

Of the four counties in the study area, Dunn and Mountrail Counties reported a per capita income in 2010 that was below the North Dakota state average. Per capita income on the Reservation was more than 42% below the state average (see Table 3.16). Reservation residents and MHA Nation members have per capita incomes and median household incomes below the averages of the counties in the analysis area, as well as statewide; and higher unemployment (Table 3.15).

3.11.5 Housing

Workforce-related housing can be a key issue associated with oil and gas development. The effect of demand from the oil and gas industry on housing can be dramatic in terms of impacts on the availability and cost of both owner-occupied and rental units. Historical information on housing in the four counties in the analysis area was obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau (EPS 2012). The 2010 Census represents the most recent data, however even that data is now close to 2 years old. As a result, the existing housing situation is difficult to characterize quantitatively with any degree of certainty, since the status of the housing market and housing availability changes daily. Table 3.17 provides housing unit supply estimates for the analysis area and the Reservation. Overall, the number of owner-occupied units increased between 2000 and 2010, with the exception of McLean County. The number of renter-occupied units also increased between 2000 and 2010, with the exception of Dunn County.

Table 3.17. Housing Data for the Reservation and Study Area Counties.

| Region | Housing Units | | | | | | | | % Change 2000-2010 |
|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|---------|---------|-----------------------|
| | Owner Occupied | | Renter Occupied | | Vacant | | Total | | |
| | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | |
| Dunn | 1,102 | 1,119 | 276 | 199 | 587 | 799 | 1,965 | 2,117 | +7.74 |
| McKenzie | 1,589 | 1,687 | 562 | 781 | 568 | 551 | 2,719 | 3,019 | +11.03 |
| McLean | 3,135 | 3,123 | 680 | 814 | 1,449 | 1,591 | 5,264 | 5,528 | +5.02 |
| Mountrail | 1,859 | 2,065 | 701 | 786 | 878 | 1,098 | 3,438 | 3,949 | +14.86 |
| Reservation | 1,122 | 1,157 | 786 | 975 | 973 | 1,190 | 2,881 | 3,322 | +15.31 |
| North Dakota | 171,299 | 184,117 | 85,853 | 92,525 | 32,525 | 36,219 | 289,677 | 312,861 | +8.00 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2011b.

The Fort Berthold Housing Authority manages a majority of the housing units within the Reservation. Housing typically consists of mutual-help homes built through various government programs, low-rent housing units, and scattered-site homes. Housing for government employees is limited, with a few quarters in Mandaree and White Shield available to Indian Health Service employees in the Four Bears Community and to BIA employees. Private purchase and rental housing are available in New Town. New housing construction has recently increased within much of the analysis area, but availability remains low.

Oil and gas development and operations have a history of affecting the availability and affordability of housing. All four counties and the Reservation had a relatively high number of vacant units, ranging from 18% to 38% of the total. The highest vacancy was reported in Dunn County (38%), followed by the Reservation (36%). The lowest was in McKenzie County (18%). The most recent data for housing starts is from 2008; while there were fewer owner-occupied units between 2000 and 2010, these four counties also ranked extremely low for both the state and national housing starts and had minimal new housing building permits between 2003 and 2008, as presented in Table 3.18.

Table 3.18. Housing Development Data for the Encompassing Counties, 2000–2008.

| Housing Development | North Dakota County | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Dunn | McKenzie | McLean | Mountrail |
| New private housing building permits 2003–2008 | 14 | 14 | 182 | 110 |
| Housing starts / state rank | 51 / 53 | 15 / 53 | 21 / 53 | 17 / 53 |
| Housing starts / national rank | 3,112 / 3,141 | 2,498 / 3,141 | 2,691 / 3,141 | 2,559 / 3,141 |

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2009a, 2009b.

3.11.6 Potential Impacts to Socioeconomics

Impacts to socioeconomic resources of the analysis area would be minor and incremental and, therefore, would not adversely impact the local area. Short-term impacts to socioeconomic resources would generally occur during the construction/drilling and completion phase of the proposed wells. Long-term effects would occur during the production phase, should the wells prove successful.

As presented in Table 3.19, implementation of the proposed wells is anticipated to employ approximately 10 to 35 workers per well during the 7-month construction and completion phase. If the wells prove successful, Enerplus would install production facilities and begin long-term production. To ensure successful operations, production activities require between one and four full-time employees to staff operations. It is anticipated that a mixture of local and Enerplus employees would staff the proposed wells.

Table 3.19. Duration of Employment during Proposed Project Implementation.

| Activity | Duration of Activity (average days per well) | Daily Personnel (average number per well) |
|---|---|--|
| Construction (access roads and well pads) | 5–8 days | 3–5 |
| Drilling | 30–35 days | 8–15 |
| Completion/Installation of facilities | Approx. 10 days | 3–8 |
| Production | Ongoing – life of well | 1–4 |

The proposed project is unlikely to result in any measurable population increases in the analysis area. While it is possible that job seekers from other localities could relocate to the area in search of employment, existing industry expertise and services in the analysis area and on the Reservation is generally adequate to support additional oil and gas development. Further, some of these project-related jobs would be derived from existing jobs that would continue as a result of continued development and operations that would otherwise have been lost; some jobs would be newly created parallel or transitional jobs. In terms of the overall population in the analysis area (over 30,000 residents in 2010; see Table 3.14), employment-related increases would be negligible, and would not likely increase the demand for services or infrastructure on the Reservation or the communities near the project area.

Further, unemployment rates in 2010 (see Table 3.15) suggest that there is an adequate workforce available in the analysis area. As a result, employment associated with well construction and production, etc. (see Table 3.19) would likely reduce unemployment in the analysis area.

In terms of project-related housing impacts, there is adequate housing for workers. As noted above, the analysis area and the Reservation had a relatively high number of vacant units, ranging from 18% to 38% in 2010 (see Table 3.17). Additionally, housing has remained available despite the growth of the population on the Reservation specifically, and across the analysis area. The levels of available housing are therefore anticipated to be adequate to absorb any minor increase in population related to this proposed project. As such, the proposed project would not have measurable impacts on housing availability or community infrastructure in the area. The proposed project also would not result in any identifiable impacts to social conditions and structures within the communities in the project area.

Implementation of the proposed project would likely result in direct and indirect economic benefits associated with industrial and commercial activities in the area, including the Reservation, State of North Dakota, and potentially to local communities near the Reservation. Direct impacts would include increased spending by contractors and workers for materials, supplies, food, and lodging in the analysis area, which would be subject to sales and lodging taxes. Other state, local, and Reservation tax payments and fees would be incurred as a result of the implementation of the proposed project, with a small percentage of these revenues distributed back to the local economies. Wages due to employment would also impact per capita income for those that were previously unemployed or underemployed.

Indirect benefits would include increased spending from increased oil and gas production, as well as a slight increase in generated taxes from the short-term operations. Mineral severance and royalty taxes, as well as other relevant county and Reservation taxes on production would also grow directly and indirectly as a result of increased industrial activity in the oil and gas industry.

3.12 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*, signed in 1994 by President Clinton, requires that federal agencies advance EJ by pursuing fair treatment and meaningful involvement of minority and low-income populations. Fair treatment means such groups should not bear a disproportionately high share of negative environmental consequences from federal programs, policies, decisions, or operations. Meaningful involvement means federal officials actively promote opportunities for public participation and federal decisions can be materially affected by participating groups and individuals.

The EPA headed the interagency workgroup established by the 1994 Executive Order and is responsible for related legal action. Working criteria for designation of targeted populations are provided in *Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses* (EPA 1998). This guidance uses a statistical approach to consider various geographic areas and scales of analysis to define a particular population's status under the Executive Order.

EJ is an evolving concept with potential for disagreement over the scope of analysis and the implications for federal responsiveness. Due to the population numbers, tribal members on the Great Plains qualify for EJ consideration as both a minority and low-income population. Table 3.20 summarizes relevant data regarding minority populations for the analysis area.

Based on data for the American Community Survey estimates (U.S. Census Bureau 2005–2010), North Dakota's total minority population in 2010 comprised approximately 58,059 persons, or 8.80% of the state's total population. This represents an increase of 27.65% over the 2000 minority population of the state. Within the analysis area, the number of Caucasian residents decreased, while minorities in nearly all categories increased. The analysis area experienced a strong increase in the percentage of minority populations during the period from 2000 until 2010 (Table 3.20) (EPS 2012). The minority populations of Dunn, McKenzie, McLean, and Mountrail Counties increased 0.62%, 13.22%, 2.80%, and 14.35%, respectively, compared with the statewide increase of 27.65%.

Table 3.20. Minority Population Breakdown by North Dakota County and Race, 2000–2010.

| Race | Dunn | | McKenzie | | McLean | | Mountrail | | North Dakota | |
|---|--------|-------|----------|-------|--------|-------|-----------|-------|--------------|---------|
| | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 | 2000 | 2010 |
| Total Population | 3,600 | 3,477 | 5,737 | 6,004 | 9,311 | 8,861 | 6,629 | 7,228 | 642,204 | 659,858 |
| Non-Hispanic | 3,573 | 3,401 | 5,679 | 5,875 | 9,230 | 8,748 | 6,542 | 7,009 | 634,418 | 646,980 |
| Hispanic or Latino ¹ | 27 | 76 | 58 | 129 | 81 | 113 | 87 | 219 | 7,786 | 12,878 |
| Races | | | | | | | | | | |
| Caucasian | 3,123 | 2,957 | 4,457 | 4,503 | 8,632 | 8,060 | 4,546 | 4,662 | 596,722 | 589,112 |
| African American | 1 | 4 | 4 | 14 | 2 | 15 | 7 | 35 | 4,157 | 6,778 |
| American Indians and Alaska Natives | 448 | 326 | 1,216 | 1,284 | 568 | 623 | 1,988 | 2,052 | 31,440 | 34,798 |
| Asian / Pacific Islanders | 8 | 14 | 4 | 58 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 9 | 3,912 | 6,132 |
| Two or more races | 25 | 141 | 39 | 74 | 97 | 55 | 71 | 286 | 5,973 | 10,351 |
| All minorities (<i>sum of races other than Caucasian</i>) | 482 | 485 | 1,263 | 1,430 | 679 | 698 | 2,083 | 2,382 | 45,482 | 58,059 |
| % minority population | 13.39 | 13.95 | 22.01 | 23.82 | 7.29 | 7.88 | 31.42 | 32.96 | 7.08 | 8.80 |
| Change in minority population (2000–2010) | +0.62% | | +13.22% | | +2.80% | | +14.35% | | +27.65% | |

¹ Hispanic or Latino may be of any race. Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2011c.

In 2010, the predominant minority group in each county was American Indians and Alaska Natives, ranging from 7.0% in McLean County to 28.4% in Mountrail County, compared to the state which was 5.0% (EPS 2012). As discussed earlier, American Indians represent 63% of the overall population on the Reservation (see Table 3.14). Poverty rate data for the counties in the analysis area are summarized in Table 3.21. The data show that poverty rates generally decreased in the analysis area between 2000 and 2010, with the exception of Mountrail County, which experienced a 0.8% increase in individuals living below the poverty level and exceeded the statewide poverty rate of 12.3% (Table 3.21). All counties within the analysis area have higher median household incomes than the statewide household income of \$46,781; however, the median family household income on the Reservation is approximately 11% lower than the statewide figure.

Table 3.21. Individual Poverty Rates and Median Household Income for the Analysis Area.

| Location | 2000 | 2010 | 2010 Median Household Income |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------|------------------------------|
| Dunn County | 13.3% | 8.6% | \$48,707 |
| McKenzie County | 15.7% | 10.0% | \$48,480 |
| McLean County | 12.3% | 9.3% | \$52,922 |
| Mountrail County | 15.7% | 16.5% | \$48,480 |
| Fort Berthold Indian Reservation | ND | 26.0% | \$41,658 |
| North Dakota | 10.4% | 12.3% | \$46,781 |

Sources: U.S. Department of Agriculture 2011; EPS 2012.

3.12.1 Potential Impacts to Environmental Justice

As demonstrated in the minority and poverty level discussions above, EJ communities are present in the analysis area. In fact, minority populations are increasing in the analysis area compared with statewide numbers, which could result in disproportionately beneficial impacts from the proposed oilfield development that would be supported by the installation of the proposed well pads. These would derive from direct and indirect economic opportunities for tribal members. Generally, existing oil and gas leasing has already benefited the MHA Nation government and infrastructure from tribal leasing, fees, and taxes. Current oil and gas leasing on the Reservation has also already generated revenue to MHA Nation members who hold surface and/or mineral interests. However, owners of allotted surface within the analysis area may not necessarily hold mineral rights. In such cases, surface owners do not receive oil and gas lease or royalty income, and their only related income would be compensation for productive acreage lost to road and well pad construction. Those with mineral interests also may benefit from royalties on commercial production if the wells prove successful. Profitable production rates at proposed locations might lead to exploration and development of additional tracts owned by currently non-benefitting allottees. In addition to increased revenue for land and mineral holders, exploration and development would increase employment on the Reservation with oversight from the Tribal Employment Rights Office, which would help alleviate some of the poverty prevalent on or near the Reservation. Tribal members without either surface or mineral rights would not receive any direct benefits, except through potential

employment, should they be hired. Indirect benefits of employment and general tribal gains would be the only potential offsets to negative impacts. Poverty rates in the analysis area have generally decreased (with the exception of Mountrail County) since oil and gas development began after 2000, as shown in Table 3.21.

Potential adverse impacts could occur to tribes and tribal members, as well, such as the potential disturbance of any traditional cultural properties and cultural resources. These potential impacts are reduced through surveys of proposed well locations and access road routes; mitigation measures required by the BIA; and thorough reviews and determinations by the BIA that there would be no effect to historic properties. The possibility of disproportionate impacts to tribes or tribal members is further reduced by the requirement for immediate work stoppage following an unexpected discovery of cultural resources of any type. Mandatory consultation would take place during any such work stoppage, affording an opportunity for all affected parties to assert their interests and contribute to an appropriate resolution, regardless of their home location or tribal affiliation.

The proposed project would not result in significant impact to any other critical element, including air quality, public health and safety, transportation, water quality, wetlands, wildlife, soils, or vegetation. Through the avoidance of such impacts, no disproportionate impact is expected to low-income or minority populations. The Proposed Action offers many positive consequences for tribal members, while recognizing EJ concerns. Procedures summarized in this document and in the APD are binding and sufficient. No laws, regulations, or other requirements have been waived; no compensatory mitigation measures are required.

3.13 MITIGATION AND MONITORING

Many protective measures and procedures are described in this document and in the APD. No laws, regulations, or other requirements have been waived; no compensatory mitigation measures are required. Monitoring of cultural resource impacts by qualified personnel is recommended during all ground-disturbing activities, as determined by the BIA. Each phase of construction and development through production could be monitored by the BLM, the BIA, and representatives of the MHA Nation to ensure the protection of cultural, archaeological, and natural resources. In conjunction with 43 CFR 46.30, 46.145, 46.310, and 46.415, a report would be developed by the BLM and the BIA that documents the results of monitoring in order to adapt the projects to eliminate any adverse impact on the environment.

Mitigation opportunities can be found in general and operator-committed BMPs and mitigation measures. BMPs are loosely defined as techniques used to lessen the visual and physical impacts of development. The BLM has created a catalog of BMPs that, when properly implemented, can assist industry in a project's design, scheduling, and construction techniques. Enerplus would implement, to the extent possible, the use of BMPs in an effort to mitigate environmental concerns in the planning phase allowing for smoother analysis, and possibly faster project approval. Many of these are required by the BLM when drilling federal or tribal leaseholds and can be found in the surface use plan in the APD.

3.13.1 General BMPs

Although largely project-specific, there are a number of BMPs that can, and should, be considered on development projects in general. The following are examples of general BMPs.

- Planning roads and facility sites to minimize visual impacts.
- Using existing roads to the extent possible, upgrading as needed.
- Reducing the size of facility sites and types of roads to minimize surface disturbance.
- Minimizing topsoil removal.
- Stockpiling stripped topsoil and protecting it from erosion until reclamation activities commence. At that time, the soil would be redistributed and seeded on the disturbed areas. The reclaimed areas would be protected and maintained until the sites are fully stabilized.
- Avoiding removal of, and damage to, trees, shrubs, and groundcover where possible. Trees near construction areas would be marked clearly to ensure that they are not removed.
- Mowing, instead of clearing, a facility or well site to accommodate vehicles or equipment.
- Maintaining buffer strips or using other sediment control measures to avoid sediment migration to stream channels as a result of construction activities.
- Planning for erosion control.
- Storing chemicals in a proper manner (including secondary containment).
- Keeping sites clean, including containing trash in a portable trash cage. The trash cage would be emptied at a state-approved sanitary landfill.
- Conducting snow removal activities in a manner that does not adversely impact reclaimed areas and areas adjacent to reclaimed areas.
- Avoiding or minimizing topographic alterations, activities on steep slopes, and disturbances within stream channels and floodplains to the extent possible.
- Maintaining buffers around work areas where there is a risk of fire as a result of construction activities.
- Keeping fire extinguishers in all vehicles.
- Planning transportation to reduce vehicle density.
- Posting speed limits on roads.
- Avoiding traveling during wet conditions that could result in excessive rutting.
- Painting facilities a color (Shale green) that would blend with the environment.
- Practicing dust abatement on roads.
- Recontouring disturbed areas to approximate the original contours of the landscape.

- Developing a final reclamation plan that allows disturbed areas to be quickly absorbed into the natural landscape.

Enerplus recognizes that there are several BMPs that can be used to mitigate environmental concerns specific to projects associated with below-ground linear alignments, such as those included in the proposed utility corridor. These include:

- following the contour (form and line) of the landscape;
- avoiding locating ROWs on steep slopes;
- sharing common ROWs;
- co-locating multiple lines in the same trench; and
- using natural (topography, vegetation) or artificial (berms) features to help screen facilities such as valves and metering stations.

Enerplus would implement these and/or other BMPs to the extent that they are technically feasible and would add strategic and measurable protection to the project area.

3.13.2 Mitigation and Safety Measures Committed to by Enerplus

3.13.2.1 Air Quality

- Transportation BMPs to reduce the amount of fugitive dust and vehicle emissions
 - Use directional drilling to drill multiple wells from a single well pad.
 - Use telemetry to remotely monitor and control production.
 - Use water or dust suppressants to control fugitive dust on roads.
 - Keep a watering truck on site during construction and water access roads as necessary, especially during periods of high winds and/or low precipitation.
 - Control road speeds.
- Vapor recovery
 - Use enclosed tanks instead of open pits to reduce fugitive VOC emissions.
- Enerplus would comply with all rules and regulations set forth in the EPA Federal Implementation Plan.

3.13.2.2 Utility Lines

All utility lines, including electric lines and other lines essential to oil well operations, would be installed underground.

3.13.2.3 Wildlife

As mentioned in Section 3.7.3, Potential Impacts to Wildlife, Enerplus has committed to using a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit, ensuring that the cuttings pit would 1) be smaller than a typical pit, and 2) contain only dry cuttings, which would be solidified with fly ash and buried in place following completion of drilling operations. Additional protections committed to by Enerplus are described below.

Bald and Golden Eagle and Migratory Bird Protective Measures

- Enerplus would schedule construction for late summer or fall/early winter so as not to disrupt waterfowl or other migratory birds during the breeding season (February 1 to July 15).
- If the construction window in the above item cannot be honored, Enerplus would degrade migratory bird habitat at the project site outside of the breeding season by mowing and/or clearing and grubbing to discourage nesting, and maintain the habitat in a degraded state until construction is completed.
- If construction is to occur within the migratory bird nesting season of February 1 to July 15, and habitat degradation has not been accomplished, Enerplus would conduct surveys at the well pads for migratory birds and their active nests (nests containing eggs or young) within 5 days of commencement of construction activities. If active nests are found during surveys, the USFWS and BIA would be presented with a proposal for maintaining adequate buffers around the nest or realigning the work to prevent the take of migratory birds.
- Maintain a minimum 0.5-mile buffer around all known or newly discovered active bald and golden eagle nests.

ESA Protective Measures

- Piping Plover and its Designated Critical Habitat, Interior Least Tern, and Pallid Sturgeon: The following measures are designed to prevent any accidental release of drilling fluids or hazardous materials into the watersheds of Lake Sakakawea.
 - Enerplus would use a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit, as specified above and in Table 2.1.
 - At all locations, a 3-foot-high 12-gauge steel containment with a 24-millimeter load out liner and concrete footer would be installed under and around all tank batteries and treaters/separators. A heavy screen-covered drip barrel would be installed under the outlet. A metal access staircase would protect the dike and support flexible hoses used by tanker trucks. This system is designed to hold 110% of the capacity of the largest tank plus one day's production to prevent hazardous runoff or spills.
 - Enerplus would implement all BMPs, erosion control measures, and spill prevention practices required by the CWA.
 - An 18-inch-tall berm would be constructed around the well pads, as summarized in Table 2.1.
 - A diversion ditch would be constructed, as needed, at well pad locations to reduce sediment loss and transportation from the well pads, as summarized in Table 2.1.
 - The corners of the well pads would be rounded, as indicated in Table 2.1.
 - Cuttings pits would include avian-safe coverings and be reclaimed immediately after wells are completed.

- Interior floor of the drilling pads would be sloped away from drainage ways. Cuttings pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick.
- Whooping crane:
 - Underground utility lines would be installed at all proposed project areas.
 - Cuttings pits would include avian-safe coverings and be reclaimed immediately after wells are completed.
 - If a whooping crane is sighted within 1 mile of the proposed project area, work would be stopped and the USFWS and BIA would be notified. In coordination with the USFWS and BIA, work may resume after the bird(s) leaves the area.
- Dakota skipper:
 - Co-locating utility corridors in road ROWs.
 - Constructing multiple wells per well pad.
 - Re-establishing suitable habitat by performing interim reclamation on disturbed areas not needed for operations after construction and drilling. Final reclamation would occur on all disturbed areas either in the short term if the well is commercially unproductive or later upon final abandonment of commercial operations.
- Consolidating well locations by designing multiple-well pads to minimize disturbance and habitat fragmentation.
- Fencing the dry cuttings pit.

3.13.2.4 Erosion Controls and Spill Prevention

- As described in detail in Section 2.2.7, spill prevention would be conducted. During commercial production, a 3-foot-high 12-gauge steel containment with a 24-millimeter load out liner and concrete footer would be installed under and around all tank batteries and treaters/separators. A heavy screen-covered drip barrel would be installed under the outlet. A metal access staircase would protect the dike and support flexible hoses used by tanker trucks. This system is designed to hold 110% of the capacity of the largest tank plus one day's production to prevent hazardous runoff or spills. Topsoil would be placed to divert flow away from the well pad locations to limit the possibility of surface contamination.
- See Table 2.1 for site-specific measures to reduce erosion.
- As described in Section 2.2.11.1, Interim Reclamation, all disturbed areas that are not needed for operations after construction and drilling are complete would be revegetated.
- As described in Section 2.2.8, Gathering Pipelines, design and safety measures would be implemented to maintain the integrity of the gathering pipelines and prevent pipeline failures or erosion. Check and manual shut-off valves would be installed at the connection between the trunk and gathering lines. Additionally, SBP's spill

prevention plan would be strictly adhered to and a spill prevention, control, and countermeasure plan would be implemented.

- Enerplus has committed to the erosion control measures detailed in Section 3.4.6.

3.13.2.5 Fire Control

Enerplus would implement fire prevention and control measures including, but not limited to, the following.

- Requiring construction crews to carry fire extinguishers in their vehicles and/or equipment.
- Training construction crews in the proper use of fire extinguishers.
- Contracting with the local fire district to provide fire protection.

3.13.2.6 Traffic and Roads

Cooperative efforts by operators, agencies, and the tribe are currently being developed and implemented across the Reservation. These measures include the following.

- Requiring construction personnel to stay within the ROW or follow designated access roads.
- Increasing the pipeline infrastructure, centralizing water depots, and developing salt water disposal wells to reduce overall truck traffic and road degradation.
- Using Tribal Employment Rights Office fees for oil and gas activities, MHA Nation funds, and IRR funds to increase the pace of maintenance and repair of roads impacted by increased truck traffic and unusually adverse weather conditions.

3.13.2.7 Cultural Resources

The following protocol would be adhered to by all construction personnel during construction and maintenance of the well pads or access roads.

- All project workers would be prohibited from collecting artifacts or disturbing cultural resources in any area under any circumstances.

If cultural resources are discovered during construction or operation, work shall immediately be stopped, the affected site be secured, and the BIA and the THPO notified. In the event of a discovery, work shall not resume until written authorization to proceed has been received from the BIA.

3.14 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

Removal and consumption of oil and/or gas from the Bakken and Three Forks formations would be an irreversible and irretreivable commitment of resources. Other potential resource commitments include land area devoted to the disposal of cuttings, soil lost to erosion (i.e., wind and water), unintentionally destroyed or damaged cultural resources, wildlife killed as a result of collision with vehicles (i.e., construction machinery and work trucks), and energy expended during construction and operation.

3.15 SHORT-TERM USE VERSUS LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Short-term development activities would not detract significantly from long-term productivity, and use, of the project areas. The construction of access roads and well pad areas would eliminate any forage or habitat use by wildlife and/or livestock. Any allottees to which compensation for land disturbance is owed would be properly compensated for the loss of land use. The initial disturbance area would decrease considerably once the wells are drilled and non-necessary areas have been reclaimed. Rapid reclamation of the project area would facilitate revived wildlife and livestock usage, stabilize the soil, and reduce the potential for erosion and sedimentation.

3.16 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Environmental impacts may accumulate either over time or in combination with similar events in the area. Unrelated and dissimilar activities may also have negative impacts on critical elements, thereby contributing to the cumulative degradation of the environment. Past and current disturbances in the vicinity of the project area include farming, grazing, roads, and other oil and gas wells. Over the past several years, exploration has accelerated over the Bakken and Three Forks formations. Most of this exploration has taken place outside the Reservation boundary on fee land, but for purposes of cumulative impact analyses, land ownership and the Reservation boundary are immaterial. The cumulative impact analysis area (CIAA) may vary depending on the particular resource under consideration, but effects may be felt as far as 20 miles from the proposed project.

Within the Reservation and near the proposed project areas, development projects remain few and widely dispersed, but off-Reservation well density is much higher, as shown in Table 3.22 and Figure 3.15. There are four active and confidential wells within a 1-mile CIAA, as shown in Table 3.22. The cumulative total of active and confidential wells within a 5-mile CIAA is 127; 658 active and confidential wells within a 10-mile CIAA; and 1,991 active and confidential wells within a 20-mile CIAA, with the number of wells on the Reservation being slightly less than those that occur off the Reservation.

Reasonably foreseeable future cumulative impacts must also be considered. If the proposed new wells prove productive, it is likely that Enerplus or other operators would pursue additional development in the area. In addition to the cumulative total of 124 wells that have already been permitted for future drilling within a 20-mile radius of the current proposal (Table 3.22), Enerplus has suggested, but not yet formally proposed, that potentially greater than 100 more wells may eventually be drilled within a 20-mile radius of the proposed project. Enerplus has also submitted or will soon submit additional proposals for 40 to 45 future new wells within 20 miles of the Proposed Action. These future foreseeable new wells would occur in T148N, R93W, T149N, R94W, and T150N, R94W.

Table 3.22. Active, Confidential, and Permitted Wells within the Cumulative Impact Analysis Area.

| Well Type | NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF | | NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, T149N, R95W: Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF | |
|--|---|-----|--|-----|
| 1-mile CIAA | | | | |
| Reservation (on/off) | On | Off | On | Off |
| Active wells | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Confidential wells | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Permitted wells | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cumulative total active and confidential wells within 1-mile CIAA: 4* | | | | |
| 5-mile CIAA | | | | |
| Reservation (on/off) | On | Off | On | Off |
| Active wells | 10 | 6 | 23 | 35 |
| Confidential wells | 25 | 10 | 11 | 7 |
| Permitted wells | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Cumulative total active and confidential wells within 5-mile CIAA: 127* | | | | |
| 10-mile CIAA | | | | |
| Reservation (on/off) | On | Off | On | Off |
| Active wells | 80 | 93 | 50 | 190 |
| Confidential wells | 88 | 46 | 42 | 69 |
| Permitted wells | 23 | 3 | 13 | 9 |
| Cumulative total active and confidential wells within 10-mile CIAA: 658* | | | | |
| 20-mile CIAA | | | | |
| Reservation (on/off) | On | Off | On | Off |
| Active wells | 250 | 729 | 240 | 485 |
| Confidential wells | 137 | 217 | 237 | 162 |
| Permitted wells | 35 | 66 | 42 | 10 |
| Cumulative total active and confidential wells within 20-mile CIAA: 1,991* | | | | |
| Cumulative total permitted wells within 20-mile CIAA: 124* | | | | |

*Duplicate wells have been eliminated from cumulative totals

CIAA = cumulative impact analysis area




Figure 3.15. Active, confidential, and permitted wells within a 1-, 5-, 10-, and 20-mile radius of the proposed project locations.

3.16.1 Cumulative Effects on Public Health and Safety

The main effect of the proposed wells and other foreseeable future well-field development on public health and safety is related to the possibility of accidental release of petroleum, drilling or HF fluids, or H₂S into the environment. A cumulative total of four active and confidential oil and gas wells currently occurs within 1 mile of the proposed multiple-well pads, and the nearest home is within 0.22 mile of the nearest well. In addition, the proposed project would add six new wells to the cumulative total of 1,991 existing wells located within 20 miles of the proposed well pads. Maintaining adequate setbacks from residences, along with adequate spill prevention measures and other emergency plans, would generally prevent hazardous materials from coming into direct contact with drinking water, surface water, and groundwater, or residential populations. However, the risk of accidental release of toxic or hazardous substances is never completely eliminated. Therefore, the proposed project would incrementally contribute to a low level of cumulative impact on public health and safety in the CIAA.

3.16.2 Cumulative Effects on Air Quality

It is anticipated that the pace and level of oil and gas development within this region of the state would continue at the current rate over the next few years and contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. The Proposed Action would incrementally contribute to emissions occurring within the region. In general, however, the increase in emissions associated with the Proposed Action would occur predominantly during construction and drilling operations and would therefore be localized, largely temporary, and limited in comparison with regional emissions.

3.16.3 Cumulative Effects on Water Resources

No surface discharge of water would occur under the Proposed Action. Any groundwater used during project development would come from an approved commercial source. The Proposed Action, when combined with other actions (cattle grazing, other oil and gas development, and agriculture) that are likely to occur in and near the project area in the future, would increase sedimentation and runoff rates. Sediment yield from active roadways could occur at higher rates than background rates and continue indefinitely. Thus, the Proposed Action could incrementally add to existing and future sources of water quality degradation in the Upper Bear Den Creek and Antelope Creek subwatersheds, but increases in degradation would be reduced by Enerplus' commitment to minimizing disturbance, using erosion control measures (such as installing matting and straw rolls on exposed slopes and constructing culverts at stream crossings), and implementing BMPs designed to reduce impacts.

No adverse impacts to potable water aquifers and associated groundwater wells are anticipated from the development of the proposed new wells, based on current data and research on the geological effects of HF methods and processes. As a result, it can be reasonably assumed that there would be no cumulative impacts as a result of current and future oil and gas development on the Reservation which target deep geological formations such as the Bakken and Three Forks.

3.16.4 Cumulative Effects on Soils

Soils across the project area could be affected as a result of soil loss, compaction, and disturbance of quality topsoil that has been largely undisturbed by development activities, grazing, and agriculture. The Proposed Action would result in a total of 8.32 acres of long-term disturbance associated with the well pads and access roads (Table 2.1), out of a total of 1,315,530 acres of land within a 20-mile radius of the project. Similar levels of soil disturbance have occurred at 1,991 existing wells within the 20-mile radius, and another 124 permitted wells, as indicated in Table 3.22. Existing and future foreseeable oil and gas development is estimated to result in long-term disturbance to approximately 21,150 acres (10 acres per well), or approximately 1.61% of the available surface area within the 20-mile radius. The project would result in an estimated relative incremental increase of 0.005% long-term disturbance when added to the existing surface disturbance.

The proposed project also includes the creation of 0.13 mile of additional lengths of unpaved roadway. A portion of the access road ROW would be reclaimed on either side of the active roadway. Unlike well pads, however, active gravel roadways are not typically reclaimed, thus sediment yield from roads can continue indefinitely at rates two to three times the background rate. However, Enerplus is committed to using BMPs to mitigate these effects. BMPs would include implementing erosion and sedimentation control measures, such as installing culverts with energy dissipating devices at culvert outlets to avoid sedimentation in ditches, constructing water bars alongside slopes, planting cover crops to stabilize soil following construction and before permanent seeding takes place. Additional information regarding BMPs can be found in Section 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring.

3.16.5 Cumulative Effects on Wetlands

Wetlands in the CIAA could be affected primarily by erosion, sedimentation and spills or other indirect effects on surface water quality. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future oil and gas drilling activities within the area would likely lead to increased sediment loads being deposited in PEM wetlands and streams. Adherence to BMPs and site-specific erosion control measures identified for this project (Table 2.1) would prevent long-term erosion and sedimentation from the proposed project. The use of similar site-specific measures for all future permitted and proposed well drilling would provide strong protections that would keep erosion at very low levels and keep future development from adversely affecting wetland functions or quality.

3.16.6 Cumulative Effects on Vegetation and Invasive Species

Vegetation resources across the project area could be affected by various activities, including additional energy development and surface disturbance of quality native prairie areas that have been largely undisturbed by development activities, grazing, and agriculture. Indirect impacts to native vegetation may be possible due to soil loss, compaction, and increased encroachment of unmanaged invasive and noxious weed species. Continued oil and gas development within the Reservation could result in the loss, and further fragmentation, of native mixed-grass prairie habitat. As described above in the Cumulative Effects on Soils (Section 3.16.4), the project would result in an estimated relative incremental increase of less than 0.005% long-term disturbance when added to the existing surface disturbance.

3.16.7 Cumulative Effects on Wildlife and Habitat

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities within the general area have reduced, and would likely continue to reduce, the amount of available habitat for listed species as well as unique wildlife, such as migratory grassland birds. Potential cumulative impacts of the proposal plus other foreseeable future oil and gas development on the Reservation could include habitat fragmentation from construction of other well pads and roads, with potential effects on migratory grassland birds. As described above in the Cumulative Effects on Soils (Section 3.16.4), the project would result in an estimated relative incremental increase of less than 0.005% long-term disturbance when added to the existing surface disturbance. The proposed project would add only a minor cumulative effect from additional habitat fragmentation.

3.16.8 Cumulative Effects on Cultural Resources

Significant archaeological resources are irreplaceable and often unique; any destruction or damage of such resources can be expected to diminish the archaeological record as a whole. However, no such damage or destruction of significant archaeological resources is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action, as these resources would be avoided, negating the cumulative impacts to the archaeological record.

3.16.9 Cumulative Effects on Transportation

The BIA IRR Inventory reports that there are approximately 671 miles of rural gravel roads on the Reservation, compared with only 285 miles of paved BIA roads serving local residents. While the existing major highways and paved BIA roads may be adequate to handle anticipated increases in passenger traffic volume and size (Tables 3.11 and 3.12), when this is combined with projected heavy truck traffic from hundreds of new wells previously authorized by BIA for the Reservation there is a potential for short-term adverse impacts to gravel roads. Without additional funding for road repair and improvement projects, these cumulative impacts could become prolonged for many of the state highways and BIA roads; such projects are outside the direct control of the operators or the local BIA officials, since the roads planning authorities and traditional funding sources would lie with state and federal agencies. However, operators, agencies, and the MHA Nation are developing and implementing cooperative efforts to address this issue (see Section 3.13.2.6); these efforts will address past activities and continue to minimize and mitigate potential future activities.

The proposed project would add new traffic volume to State Highways 22 and 23, as well as BIA Roads 12 (paved) and 30 (gravel), before entering the access roads that Enerplus proposes to construct, improve, and maintain. The proposed project would increase traffic by an average of 15 to 20 heavy trucks per day, and 15 to 40 pick-up trucks per day over the 7-month construction period. If authorized by BIA, other current proposals from Enerplus would include, approximately, an additional 60 to 75 new wells being drilled nearby and using portions of BIA Roads 12, 14, 17, and 30. The combined future foreseeable traffic and heavy loads would therefore increase by an estimated 30 heavy truck round-trips, and 30 to 60 pick-up trips spread out over a 7-month construction period. BIA Road 12 through Mandaree would potentially be affected by the cumulative increase in construction traffic. The IRR report indicates that BIA Road 12 was in good construction condition in 2006 (IRR 2011). No

other drilling permits are known to have been authorized within 1 mile of the proposed well pads (Table 3.22). Given the recent condition of BIA Road 12, this expected level of added road use may be inconvenient to the residents living in or near Mandaree along BIA Road 12, but would be unlikely to result in serious road degradation or other adverse cumulative impacts on traffic.

3.16.10 Cumulative Effects on Socioeconomics

The Proposed Action would incrementally add to existing and future socioeconomic impacts in the general area. The Proposed Action includes six wells, which would be an additional source of revenue for some residents of the Reservation. Increases in employment would be temporary during the construction, drilling, and completion phases of the proposed project. Therefore, little change in employment would be expected over the long term.

Although oil and gas development is the dominant commercial activity in the CIAA, current impacts to the natural environment from oil and gas-related activities are still fairly dispersed, and the required and operator-committed BMPs would limit potential impacts. Current farming and ranching activities are expected to continue with little change because virtually all available acreage is already organized into range units. Undivided interests in the land surface, range permits, and agricultural leases are often held by different tribal members than those holding mineral rights. No significant negative impacts are expected to affect any critical element of the human environment; impacts would generally be low and mostly temporary.

4.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

The BIA must continue to make efforts to solicit the opinions and concerns of all stakeholders (Table 4.1). For the purpose of this EA, a stakeholder is considered any agency, municipality, or individual person to which the proposed action may affect either directly or indirectly in the form of public health, environmental, or socioeconomic issues. A scoping letter declaring the location of the proposed project areas and explaining the Proposed Action was sent in advance of this EA to allow stakeholders ample time to submit comments or requests for additional information. Additionally, a copy of this EA would be submitted to all cooperating federal agencies and also to those agencies with interests in or near the project area that could be affected by the Proposed Action.

Table 4.1. Scoping Comments.

| Organization | Name | Comment | Response to Comment |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Barnes County Municipal Airport | Lindemann, Larry | No Comment | |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | Bercier, Marilyn | No Comment | |
| Bureau of Land Management | Bagley, Lonny | No Comment | |
| Bureau of Land Management | Nash, Mike | No Comment | |
| Dunn County | Hauck, Reinhard | No Comment | |
| Dunn County | Kadmas, Ray | No Comment | |
| Enerplus Resources Corp | Overbey, Rachel | No Comment | |
| EOG Resources, Inc | Smith, Heather | No Comment | |
| Federal Aviation Administration | Dressler, Patricia | No Comment | |
| Federal Emergency Management Agency | Kyner, Dave | Recommends that Enerplus contacts the local Floodplain Manager for the Fort Berthold Reservation to receive further guidelines regarding the impact that the project might have to the regulations of the National Flood Insurance Program. | Project area is not in a flood hazard area. Please see Section 3.3, Water Resources. |
| Fort Berthold Agency | Yellowboy, Patti | No Comment | |
| Fort Berthold Rural Water Director | Danks, Marvin | No Comment | |
| Garrison Project Office | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District | No Comment | |
| Indian Affairs Commission | Davis, Scott | No Comment | |
| Killdeer, Weydahl Field Airport | Hoffman, Warren | No Comment | |
| McKenzie County | Cayko, Richard | No Comment | |
| McKenzie County | Olson, Frances | No Comment | |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Organization | Name | Comment | Response to Comment |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| McLean County Board of Commissioners | Hudson-Schenfisch, Julie | No Comment | |
| McLean Electric Cooperative, Inc. | Rudolph, Reginald | No Comment | |
| Mercer County Board of Commissioners | Mercer County | No Comment | |
| Midcontinent Cable Company | Boyd, Bill | No Comment | |
| Minot Air Force Base | Chief Missile Engineer | No Comment | |
| Montana Dakota Utilities | Dixon, Doug | No Comment | |
| Mountrail Board of County Commissioners | Hynek, David | No Comment | |
| National Park Service, Midwest Region | Chevance, Nick | No Comment | |
| Natural Resources Conservation Service | Podoll, Mary E. | Steven Sieler: The Farmland Protection Policy Act does not apply, no further action is needed. We recommend that impacts to wetlands be avoided. | Thank you for your comment. See Section 3.5, Wetlands. |
| New Town Municipal Airport | Johnson, Harley | No Comment | |
| NoDak Electric Cooperative, Inc. | Berg, George | No Comment | |
| North Dakota Department of Health | Glatt, David | Impacts minor and can be controlled by using proper construction methods. | See Site-specific Owner-committed Measures in Table 2.1, and Sections 2.2.10, Construction Details at Individual Sites, and 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring, for site-specific details and BMPs. |
| North Dakota Department of Transportation | Peterson, Walter | No Comment | |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Organization | Name | Comment | Response to Comment |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| North Dakota Game and Fish Department | Link, Greg | Recommend that construction be avoided to the extent possible within native prairie, wooded draws, riparian corridors, and wetland areas. Also suggest that botanical surveys be completed during appropriate season and aerial surveys be conducted for raptor nests before construction begins. | Thank you for your comment. See Sections 3.6, Vegetation and Invasive Species, and 3.7, Wildlife and Habitat, for more information. |
| North Dakota Parks and Recreation | Prchal, Doug | No Comment | |
| Northern Border Pipeline Company | Land Department | No Comment | |
| Parshall-Hankins Field Airport | Kuehn, John | No Comment | |
| Petro-Hunt, LLC | Herman, Jeff | No Comment | |
| Reservation Telephone Cooperative | Jarski, Tim | No Comment | |
| Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe | Selvage, Michael | No Comment | |
| Southwest Water Authority | Massad, Mary | No Comment | |
| Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe | Pearson, Myra | No Comment | |
| Standing Rock Sioux Tribe | Murphy, Charles | No Comment | |
| State Historical Society of North Dakota | Paaverud, Merl | Requests that a copy of cultural resource site forms and reports be sent to the State Historical Society office to keep archives current. | Reports will be submitted to the required agencies. See Section 3.8, Cultural Resources. |
| THPO, Three Affiliated Tribes | Crows Breast, Elgin | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Brugh, V. Judy | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Fox, Fred | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Hall, Tex | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | NAGPRA Office | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Natural Resources Department | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Packineau, Mervin | No Comment | |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Organization | Name | Comment | Response to Comment |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Poitra, Fred | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Strabs, Arnold | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Whitcalf, Frank | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Williams, Damon | No Comment | |
| Three Affiliated Tribes | Wolf, Malcolm | No Comment | |
| Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa | Ferris, Kade | No Comment | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Cimarosti, Dan | No Comment | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Laux, Eric | No Comment | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Sorenson, Charles | No Comment | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Sellers, Randal | No Comment | |
| U.S. Army Corps of Engineers | Werner, Sam | For any proposed well where the well line and/or bottom hole is under or crosses under Lake Sakakawea, regardless of depth, we require that project proponent submit a completed permit application (ENG Form 4345) to the Corps. | No project component is under or crosses under Lake Sakakawea. See Section 2.2.10, Construction Details at Individual Sites. |
| U.S. Bureau of Reclamation | Nelson, Richard | Kelly McPhillips: Project components would affect Bureau of Reclamation facilities (rural water pipelines). Please review enclosed map for potential adverse effects and proper pipeline crossing, should that be necessary. Coordinate with the Reclamation Rural Water Director. | See Section 2.2.3, Access Roads and Utility Corridors. Bureau of Reclamation engineer Tom Thompson has been contacted about a project component potentially crossing a rural water line in Section 35, T149N, R95W. Project plans were sent to him for review. |
| U.S. Department of Agriculture | Hecker, Ron | No Comment | |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Dhieux, Joyce | No Comment | |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Hefferman, Dan | No Comment | |

Environmental Assessment: Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads (September 2012)

| Organization | Name | Comment | Response to Comment |
|--|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Svoboda, Larry | No Comment | |
| U.S. Environmental Protection Agency | Truskowski, Brent | No Comment | |
| U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | Towner, Jeffrey | Comments given during USFWS scoping. | Please see Sections 3.7, Wildlife and Habitat, and 3.13, Mitigation and Monitoring. |
| Ward County Board of Commissioners | Erickson, Carroll | No Comment | |
| West Plains Electric Cooperative, Inc. | Schelkoph, David | No Comment | |
| Western Area Power Administration | Paulson, Gerald | No Comment | |
| Williams Production RMT Co. | Head, Jennifer | No Comment | |
| Williams Production RMT Co. | Klitzka, Nelson | No Comment | |
| Xcel Energy | Manager | No Comment | |

5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

An interdisciplinary team contributed to this document according to guidance provided in Part 1502.6 of CEQ regulations. This document was drafted by SWCA under the direction of the BIA. Information was compiled from various sources within SWCA.

Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation

- Josh Ruffo, Environmental Compliance Coordinator

SWCA Environmental Consultants

- Kimberly Ip, Biologist; Laura Leslie Burckhardt and Nathan Wojcik, Ecologists
Prepared the EA.
- Laura Leslie Burckhardt and Pete Christensen, Ecologists
Reviewed and edited the EA.
- David Myers, Mike Fettes, and Kimberly Ip, Biologists
Conducted natural resource surveys.
- Jolene Schleicher, Matthew Cox, Adam Leroy, Cole Wandler, Scott Yost, Craig Host, Chelsea Drucker, Kyle McLean, Ashley Persinger, and Mike Sobiech, Archaeologists
Conducted cultural resource surveys.
- Jolene Schleicher and Adam Leroy, Archaeologists
Prepared cultural resource reports for well pads and access roads.
- Arjun Dongre, GIS Specialist
Created maps and spatially derived data.

6.0 REFERENCES

- Arthur, D.J., B.P.G. Bohm, and M. Layne. 2008. Hydraulic Fracturing Considerations for Natural Gas Wells of the Marcellus Shale. Presented at the Ground Water Protection Council 2008 Annual Forum, Cincinnati, Ohio, September 21–24, 2008.
- Bryce, S., J.M. Omernik, D.E. Pater, M. Ulmer, J. Schaar, J. Freeouf, R. Johnson, P. Kuck, and S.H. Azevedo. 1998. Ecoregions of North Dakota and South Dakota. Jamestown, North Dakota: Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Online. Available online at <http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/habitat/ndsdeco/index.htm>. Accessed October 12, 2010.
- Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). 2001. 2001 American Indian population and labor force report. Available online at <http://www.indianaffairs.gov/WhatWeDo/Knowledge/Reports/index.htm>. Accessed December 2009.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2011a. Local area unemployment statistics. Available online at <http://www.bls.gov/lau/tables.htm>. Accessed January 26, 2011.
- . 2011b. Labor force data by county, not seasonally adjusted, October 2009–November 2010. Available online at <http://www.bls.gov/lau/laucntycur14.txt>. Accessed January 26, 2011.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM). 2009. Air resource BMPs – best management practices for fluid minerals. Available online at http://www.blm.gov/wo/st/en/prog/energy/oil_and_gas/best_management_practices/technical_information.html. Accessed August 2009.
- Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS). 2007. Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development. BLM/WO/ST-06/021+3071/REV 07. Bureau of Land Management. Denver, Colorado. 84 pp.
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service. Washington, D.C. 79 pp.
- Croft, M.G. 1985. Groundwater resources of McKenzie County, North Dakota. Bulletin 80 – Part III. North Dakota Geological Survey. Available online at http://www.swc.state.nd.us/4dlink9/4dcgi/GetSubContentPDF/PB-289/McKenzie_Part_3.pdf. Accessed November 9, 2011.
- Economic Profile System, Human Dimensions Toolkit (EPS). 2012. A profile of demographics, Dunn, McKenzie, McLean, and Mountrail Counties, North Dakota, and the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. Available online at www.headwaterseconomics.org. Accessed May 23, 2012.

- Energy Information Administration. 2006. Technology-based Oil and Natural Gas Plays: Shale Shock! Could there be Billions in the Bakken? Energy Information Administration, Office of Oil and Gas, Reserves and Production Division, November 2006.
- Fort Berthold Housing Authority. 2008. Mandan, Hidatsa, Arikara website. Available online at http://www.mhanation.com/main/history_economic_social.html. Accessed November 2009.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2010. Federal Lands Highway Office. Available online at <http://flh.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/irr/>. Accessed May 10, 2011.
- High Plains Regional Climate Center. 2008. Historical climate data summaries. Available online at <http://www.hprcc.unl.edu/data/historicl>. Accessed May 2008.
- Indian Reservation Roads (IRR). 2011. Indian Reservation Roads Program Inventory Data Sheet (Version 2), FY 2011 Inventory; Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. July 25, 2011.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2007. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and A. Reisinger (Eds.), Geneva, Switzerland. Available online at http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr.pdf. Accessed October 25, 2010.
- Klausing, R.L. 1979. Groundwater resources of Dunn County, North Dakota. Bulletin 68 – Part III. North Dakota Geological Survey. Available online at http://www.swc.state.nd.us/4dlink9/4dcgi/GetSubContentPDF/PB-225/Dunn_Part_3.pdf. Accessed November 9, 2011.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association. 2010. National Climatic Data Center, State of the Climate: National Overview for January 2010. Published online February 2010. Available online at <http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/?report=national&year=2009&month=13>. Accessed October 25, 2010.
- National Park Service 2010. Visibility protection. Available online at <http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/regs/visibility.cfm>. Accessed October 4, 2010.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 1998. National Forestry Manual. United States Department of Agriculture, National Resources Conservation Service, Title 190-V-NFM. September 1998.
- . 2012a. Soil Data Mart. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Dunn and McKenzie Counties, North Dakota. Available online at <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov>. Accessed July 15, 2012.

- . 2012b. Ecological site descriptions. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Available online at <http://esis.sc.egov.usda.gov/Welcome/pgReportLocation.aspx?type=ESD>. Accessed March 5, 2012.
- North Dakota Department of Agriculture (NDDA). 2012. 2011 noxious weed list survey - reported acres. Available online at <http://www.nd.gov/ndda/program/noxious-weeds>. Accessed July 11, 2012.
- North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH). 2012. Air quality: Ambient monitoring annual reports. Available online at <http://www.ndhealth.gov/AQ/AmbientMonitoring.htm>. Accessed April 16, 2012.
- North Dakota Department of Health, Division of Water Quality. 2011. Watershed boundary dataset. Available online at <http://web.apps.state.nd.us/hubdataportal/srv/en/metadata.show?currTab=simple&id=101>. Accessed February 7, 2011.
- North Dakota Department of Transportation. 2011. Average daily traffic and vehicle accident data for Fort Berthold Indian Reservation state highways. Data provided to SWCA Environmental Consultants on July 20, 2011.
- North Dakota Game and Fish Department. 2010. Golden eagle nests within the boundary of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation databases. From Steve Ryke, September 20, 2010. Data available from North Dakota Game and Fish Department upon request.
- North Dakota Parks and Recreation. 2011a. Killdeer Mountain/Four Bears Scenic Byway. Available online at <http://www.parkrec.nd.gov/byways/killdeer/killdeer.html>. Accessed August 9, 2011.
- . 2011b. Scoping comment letter dated July 25, 2011, from Jesse Hanson, North Dakota Parks and Recreation, Coordinator of Planning and Natural Resource Division.
- . 2012. Natural heritage program. Available online at <http://www.parkrec.nd.gov/nature/heritage.html>. Access June 26, 2012.
- North Dakota State Water Commission. 2011. North Dakota State Water Commission Mapservice. Available online at <http://mapservice.swc.state.nd.us/>. Accessed July 11, 2011.
- Peterson, J. 1995. Williston Basin Province, in U.S. Geological Survey 1995 National Assessment of United States Oil and Gas Resources, Digital Data Series DDS-30, Release 2, CD-ROM.
- Pew Center. 2009. Climate change 101: Understanding and responding to global climate change. Available online at <http://www.pewclimate.org/docUploads/Climate101-Complete-Jan09.pdf>. Accessed October 25, 2010.

- Ross, M. 1990. The Clean Air Act. Chapter 4 in M. A. Mantell, ed. *Managing National Park System Resources: A Handbook of Legal Duties, Opportunities, and Tools*. The Conservation Foundation, Washington, D.C.
- Schleicher, J. 2012. A Class I and Class III Cultural Resource Inventory of the Enerplus Resources Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF Well Pad and Access Road/Utility Corridor, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, Dunn County, North Dakota. Prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Sheridan, Wyoming, for Enerplus Resources.
- Schleicher, J., and A. Leroy. 2012. A Class I and Class III Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluative Shovel Testing of 32MZ936 for the Enerplus Ruby 148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire 148-95-3B-10H, Rod 148-95-36D-25H, and Reel 148-95-36D-25H TF Well Pad, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, McKenzie County, North Dakota. Prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants, Sheridan, Wyoming, for Enerplus Resources.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2010. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Great Plains Region (Version 2.0). Edited by J.S. Wakeley, R.W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-08-12. Vicksburg, Mississippi: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. 2011a. Regional economic accounts. Local area personal income. Table CA25 – Total Employment by Industry. Available online at <http://www.bea.gov/regional/reis/scb.cfm>. Accessed January 24, 2011.
- . 2011b. Regional economic accounts. State annual personal income. Table SA25N-Total Full-time and Part-time Employment by NAICS Industry. Available online at <http://www.bea.gov/regional/spi/action.cfm>. Accessed January 24, 2011.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2005–2010. American Community Survey. Available online at <http://www.census.gov/acs/www/>. Accessed June 11, 2012.
- . 2009a. Building permits (county). Available online at <http://www.census.gov/const/www/permitsindex.html>. Accessed December 1, 2009.
- . 2009b. Profile of general demographic characteristics. Available online at http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/QTTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=25000US1160&-qr_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_DP1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-_sse=on. Accessed December 1, 2009.
- . 2010. Economic Research Service. County-level unemployment and median household income for North Dakota. Available online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/Unemployment/RDLList2.asp?ST=ND>. Accessed January 26, 2011.
- . 2011a. Resident population data. Available online at <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/data/apportionment-pop-text.php>. Accessed January 24, 2011.

- . 2011b. State & County QuickFacts. Available online at <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/38000.html>. Accessed January 24, 2011.
- . 2011c. USA counties. Available online at <http://censtats.census.gov/cgi-bin/usac/usatable.pl>. Accessed January 24, 2011.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2011. Economic Research Service; County level unemployment and median household income for North Dakota. Available online at <http://www.ers.usda.gov/data/unemployment/RDList2.asp?ST=ND>. Accessed March 11, 2011.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998. Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses. Office of Federal Activities, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Washington, D.C. 70 pp. + appendices.
- . 1999. Preferred and Alternatives for Estimating Air Emissions from Oil and Gas Field Production and Operations. Emission Inventory Improvement Program, Vol. II, Chapter 10. September 3, 1999.
- . 2004. Evaluation of impacts to underground sources of drinking water by hydraulic fracturing of coalbed methane reservoirs study. EPA 816-R-04-033. Available online at http://water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/class2/hydraulicfracturing/wells_coalbedmethanestudy.cfm. Accessed November 9, 2011.
- . 2011a. National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html>. Accessed November 10, 2011.
- . 2011b. Climate change-science. Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/emissions/>. Accessed November 10, 2011.
- . 2011c. Climate change-regulatory initiatives. Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/initiatives/index.html>. Accessed November 10, 2011.
- . 2011d. STORET and WXQ, EPA's repository and framework for sharing water monitoring data. Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/storet/>. Accessed November 9, 2011.
- . 2011e. Clean Water Act, Section 402: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. Available online at <http://water.epa.gov/lawsregs/guidance/wetlands/section402.cfm>. Accessed November 9, 2011.
- . 2011f. Hydraulic fracturing. Available online at <http://water.epa.gov/type/groundwater/uic/class2/hydraulicfracturing/index.cfm>. Accessed March 9, 2011.

- . 2012a. Air quality indices, by county. Available online at http://www.epa.gov/airquality/airdata/ad_rep_con.html. Accessed July 10, 2012.
- . 2012b. Watershed Assessment, Tracking & Environmental Results. Available online at <http://www.epa.gov/waters/index.html>. Accessed July 26, 2012.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011. National Wetland Inventory wetlands mapper. Available online at <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>. Accessed January 10, 2011.
- . 2012. North Dakota Field Office endangered species. Available online at http://www.fws.gov/northdakotafieldoffice/endspecies/endangered_species.htm. Accessed May 9, 2012.
- Williams, B.B., and M.E. Bluemle. 1978. Status of Mineral Resource Information for the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, North Dakota. Administrative Report BIA-40. 35 pp.

7.0 ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|------------------|--|
| °F | degrees Fahrenheit |
| ADT | average daily traffic |
| APD | Application for Permit to Drill |
| AQI | air quality index |
| BIA | Bureau of Indian Affairs |
| BLM | Bureau of Land Management |
| BMP | best management practice |
| CAA | Clean Air Act |
| CEQ | Council on Environmental Quality |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CH ₄ | methane |
| CIAA | cumulative impact analysis area |
| CO | carbon monoxide |
| CO ₂ | carbon dioxide |
| CWA | Clean Water Act |
| DBH | diameter at breast height |
| EA | environmental assessment |
| EJ | Environmental Justice |
| Enerplus | Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation |
| EPA | Environmental Protection Agency |
| EPS | Economic Profile System |
| ESA | Endangered Species Act |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| GHG | greenhouse gas |
| H ₂ S | hydrogen sulfide |
| HAP | hazardous air pollutant |
| HF | hydraulic fracturing |
| HUC | hydrologic unit code |
| IPCC | Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change |
| IRR | Indian Reservation Roads |
| MHA Nation | Three Affiliated Tribes of the Mandan, Hidatsa, and Arikara Nation |
| N ₂ O | nitrous oxide |
| NAAQS | National Ambient Air Quality Standards |
| NDDA | North Dakota Department of Agriculture |
| NDDH | North Dakota Department of Health |
| NDDOT | North Dakota Department of Transportation |
| NDIC | North Dakota Industrial Commission |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| NO ₂ | nitrogen dioxide |
| NPDES | National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System |
| NRCS | Natural Resources Conservation Service |
| NRHP | National Register of Historic Places |
| NWI | National Wetlands Inventory |
| O ₃ | ozone |

| | |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| PEM | palustrine freshwater emergent |
| PM | particulate matter |
| ppm | parts per million |
| Reservation | Fort Berthold Indian Reservation |
| ROW | right-of-way |
| SBP | Saddle Butte Pipeline, LLC |
| SO ₂ | sulfur dioxide |
| SWCA | SWCA Environmental Consultants |
| THPO | Tribal Historic Preservation Officer |
| TMD | total measured depth |
| TRNP | Theodore Roosevelt National Park |
| TVD | total vertical depth |
| USACE | U.S. Army Corps of Engineers |
| USC | United States Code |
| USFS | U.S. Forest Service |
| USFWS | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| VOC | volatile organic compound |

APPENDIX A
Threatened and Endangered Species in McKenzie County

SPECIES ACCOUNTS AND EFFECTS DETERMINATIONS

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Black-footed Ferret (*Mustela nigripes*)

Effects Determination: No Effect

Black-footed ferrets are nocturnal, solitary carnivores of the weasel family that have been largely extirpated from the wild primarily due to range-wide decimation of the prairie dog (*Cynomys* sp.) ecosystem (Kotliar et al. 1999). They have been listed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as endangered since 1967, and have been the object of extensive re-introduction programs (USFWS 2010a). Ferrets inhabit extensive prairie dog complexes of the Great Plains, typically composed of several smaller colonies in proximity to one another that provide a sustainable prey base. The *Black-footed Ferret Survey Guidelines for Compliance with the Endangered Species Act* (USFWS 1989) states that ferrets require black-tailed prairie dog (*Cynomys ludovicianus*) towns or complexes greater than 80 acres in size, and towns of this dimension may be important for ferret recovery efforts (USFWS 1988a). Prairie dog towns of this size are not found in the project area. In addition, this species has not been observed within the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. The proposed project would have **no effect** on this species.

Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*)

Effects Determination: No Effect

The gray wolf, listed as endangered in the United States in 1978, was believed extirpated from North Dakota in the 1920s and 1930s with only sporadic reports from the 1930s to present (Licht and Huffman 1996). The presence of wolves in most of North Dakota consists of occasional dispersing animals from Minnesota and Manitoba (Licht and Fritts 1994; Licht and Huffman 1996). Most documented gray wolf sightings that have occurred within North Dakota are believed to be young males seeking to establish territory (Hagen et al. 2005). The Turtle Mountains region in north-central North Dakota provides marginal habitat that may be able to support a very small population of wolves. The closest known pack of wolves is the Minnesota population located approximately 28 kilometers (km) from the northeast corner of North Dakota.

The gray wolf uses a variety of habitats that support a large prey base, including montane and low-elevation forests, grasslands, and desert scrub (USFWS 2010b). Due to a lack of forested habitat and distance from Minnesota and Manitoba populations, as well as the troubled relationship between humans and wolves and their vulnerability to being shot in open habitats (Licht and Huffman 1996), the re-establishment of gray wolf populations in North Dakota is unlikely. Additionally, habitat fragmentation, in particular road construction as a result of oil and gas development, may further act as a barrier against wolf recolonization in western North Dakota. Therefore, the proposed project would have **no effect** on the gray wolf.

Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The whooping crane was listed as endangered in 1970 in the United States by the USFWS, and in 1978 in Canada. Historically, population declines were caused by shooting and

destruction of nesting habitat in the prairies from agricultural development. Current threats to the species includes habitat destruction, especially suitable wetland habitats that support breeding and nesting, as well as feeding and roosting during their fall and spring migration (Canadian Wildlife Service and USFWS 2007).

The July 2010 total wild population was estimated at 383 (USFWS 2010c). There is only one self-sustaining wild population, the Aransas-Wood Buffalo National Park population, which nests in Wood Buffalo National Park and adjacent areas in Canada, where approximately 83% of the wild nesting sites occur (Canadian Wildlife Service and USFWS 2007; USFWS 2010c). McKenzie County, including the project area, is within the primary migratory flyway of whooping cranes.

Whooping cranes probe the soil subsurface with their bills for foods on the soil or vegetation substrate (Canadian Wildlife Service and USFWS 2007). Whooping cranes are omnivores and foods typically include agricultural grains, as well as insects, frogs, rodents, small birds, minnows, berries, and plant tubers. The largest amount of time during migration is spent feeding in harvested grain fields (Canadian Wildlife Service and USFWS 2007). Studies indicate that whooping cranes use a variety of habitats during migration, in addition to cultivated croplands, and generally roost in small palustrine (marshy) wetlands within 1 km of suitable feeding areas (Howe 1987, 1989). Whooping cranes have been recorded in riverine habitats during their migration, with eight sightings along the Missouri River in North Dakota (Canadian Wildlife Service and USFWS 2007:18). In these cases, they roost on submerged sandbars in wide, unobstructed channels that are isolated from human disturbance (Armbruster 1990).

Suitable whooping crane foraging habitat (i.e., cultivated cropland) was observed near the project area. Underground utility lines would be utilized at all proposed project areas. Additionally, project precautionary measures would be implemented if a whooping crane is sighted in or near the project area. Enerplus would cease all drilling and construction activities and notify the USFWS and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) of the sighting should a crane be spotted within 1 mile of the project area. As a result, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** the endangered whooping crane.

Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The piping plover is a small shorebird which breeds only in three geographic regions of North America: the Atlantic Coast, the Northern Great Plains, and the Great Lakes. Piping plover populations were federally listed as threatened and endangered in 1985, with the Northern Great Plains and Atlantic Coast populations listed as threatened, and the Great Lakes population listed as endangered (USFWS 1985a).

Plovers in the Great Plains make their nests on open, sparsely vegetated sand or gravel beaches adjacent to alkali wetlands, and on beaches, sand bars, and dredged material islands of major river systems (USFWS 2002, 2010d). The shorelines of the Missouri River lakes constitute significant nesting areas for the bird. Piping plovers nest on the ground, making shallow scrapes in the sand, which they line with small pebbles or rocks (USFWS 1988b). Anthropogenic alterations of the landscape along rivers and lakes where piping plover nest

have increased the number and type of predators, subsequently decreasing nest success and chick survival (USFWS 2002, 2010d). The birds fly south by mid to late August to areas along the Texas coast and Mexico (USFWS 2002). The Northern Great Plains population has continued to decline despite federal listing, with population estimates of 1,500 breeding pairs in 1985 reduced to fewer than 1,100 in 1990. Low survival of adult birds has been identified as a factor (Root et al. 1992). Current conservation strategies include identification and preservation of known nesting sites, public education, and limiting or preventing shoreline disturbances near nests and hatched chicks (USFWS 1988b, 2010d).

Suitable shoreline habitat for breeding and nesting plovers does not occur in the project area, and Lake Sakakawea is a minimum of 11.03 river miles from the proposed well pads and access roads. Piping plover may stop-over within the project area during migration, however it is unlikely due to the limited availability of alkali wetlands in or surrounding the project area.

Potential pollution and sedimentation occurring within the project area are concerns for piping plover and their forage base. If minor tributaries and/or wooded draws are within 300 feet of proposed project components, secondary containment measures are applied by the BIA to prevent spills. Activities associated with the construction, production, or reclamation of the proposed project area are not anticipated to adversely affect water quality and subsequently the piping plover. Additionally, a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit would be used at the well pad locations. All locations would comply with BIA Conditions of Approval (COAs) and spill prevention standards; the interior floor of the drilling pads would be sloped away from drainage ways; and cuttings pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick. Therefore, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** piping plovers.

Designated Critical Habitat of Piping Plover

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The USFWS has Designated Critical Habitat for the Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains populations of piping plover (USFWS 2002). Designated Critical Habitat for the piping plover includes 183,422 acres and 1,207.5 river miles of habitat, including areas near the proposed project, along the shoreline of Lake Sakakawea in Dunn County, North Dakota (USFWS 2002).

Suitable shoreline habitat for breeding and nesting plovers does not occur in the project area, and Lake Sakakawea is a minimum of 11.03 river miles from the proposed well pads and access roads. Activities associated with the construction, production, or reclamation of the proposed project area are not anticipated to adversely affect water quality and subsequently any Designated Critical Habitat for piping plover

All locations would comply with BIA COAs and spill prevention standards; the interior floor of the drilling pads would be sloped away from drainage ways; and cuttings pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick. Therefore, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** Designated Critical Habitat of the piping plover.

Interior Least Tern (*Sterna antillarum*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The interior population of the least tern is listed as endangered by the USFWS (1985b). This bird is the smallest member of the gull and tern family, measuring approximately 9 inches in length. Terns remain near flowing water, where they feed by hovering over and diving into standing or flowing water to catch small fish (USFWS 2010e).

The interior population of least terns breeds in isolated areas along the Missouri, Mississippi, Ohio, Red, and Rio Grande River systems, where they nest in small colonies. From late April to August, terns nest in a shallow hole scraped in an open sandy area, gravel patch, or exposed flat and bare sandbars along rivers, sand and gravel pits, or lake and reservoir shorelines. The adults continue to care for chicks after they hatch. Least terns in North Dakota are often found sharing sandbars with the piping plover, a threatened species (USFWS 2010e).

Census data indicate over 8,000 least terns in the interior population. In North Dakota, the least tern is found mainly on the Missouri River from Garrison Dam south to Lake Oahe, and on the Missouri and Yellowstone Rivers upstream of Lake Sakakawea (USFWS 1990a, 2010e). Approximately 100 pairs breed in North Dakota (USFWS 2010e). Details of their migration are not known, but their winter range is reported to include the Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Islands (USFWS 1990a, 2010e).

Loss of suitable breeding and nesting habitat for terns has resulted from dam construction and river channelization on major rivers throughout the Mississippi, Missouri, and Rio Grande River systems. River and reservoir changes have led to reduced sandbar formation and other shoreline habitats for breeding, resulting in population declines. In addition, other human shoreline disturbances affect the species (USFWS 1990a). Critical Habitat has not been designated for the species (USFWS 2010e).

Current conservation strategies include identification and avoidance of known nesting areas, public education, and limiting or preventing shoreline disturbances near nests and hatched chicks (USFWS 2010e).

Suitable shoreline habitat for breeding and nesting terns does not occur in the project area, and Lake Sakakawea is a minimum of 11.03 river miles from the proposed well pads and access roads. Terns can forage up to 40 miles from colony sites located near the Missouri River and Lake Sakakawea. Interior least terns may visit perennial streams and wetlands near the project area for foraging; however, it is unlikely that terns would visit the upland habitats present in the project area.

Potential pollution and sedimentation occurring within the project area are concerns for interior least terns and their forage base. If minor tributaries and/or wooded draws are within 300 feet of proposed project components, secondary containment measures are applied by the BIA to prevent spills. Activities associated with the construction, production, or reclamation of the proposed project area are not anticipated to adversely affect water quality and subsequently the least tern. Additionally, a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit would be used at the well pad locations. All locations would comply with BIA COAs and spill prevention standards; the interior floor of the drilling pads would be sloped

away from drainage ways; and cutting pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick. Therefore, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** endangered least terns.

Sprague's Pipit (*Anthus spragueii*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The Sprague's pipit is a small passerine, 10 to 15 centimeters in length, endemic to the Northern Great Plains (USFWS 2010f). The Sprague's pipit requires large tracts of native prairie habitats, unplowed, throughout their life cycle. Because native grasslands are adapted to periodic disturbance events (i.e., fire), Sprague's pipit prefers mixed-grass prairie habitats that experience regular natural disturbance. The frequency of disturbance required for habitat maintenance depends on how quickly grasses grow to an intermediate height (4 to 12 inches) following a disturbance event. Previously cultivated non-native grassland may provide nesting habitat if the vegetation structure is appropriate (Jones 2010).

In North Dakota, Sprague's pipit has been found in areas of moderate grazing. Sprague's pipits are sensitive to patch size and avoid edges between grasslands and other habitat features (USFWS 2010f). They may avoid non-grassland features including roads, trails, oil wells, croplands, woody vegetation, and wetlands. The Sprague's pipit is reported to stay up to 350 meters away from anthropogenic features such as roads, oil wells, and wind turbines (USFWS 2010f). The USFWS has estimated that each new oil well and associated road in North Dakota results in potential impacts approximately 51 acres (21 hectares) of pipit habitat due to avoidance and habitat fragmentation (USFWS 2010f). Due to increasing habitat fragmentation, especially by energy development, throughout the Sprague's pipit range and the loss of native prairie habitat, the Sprague's pipit was listed as a Candidate Species under the ESA in 2010 (USFWS 2010f).

In North Dakota, Sprague's pipit breeds throughout the state except for the easternmost counties. During the breeding season they prefer large patches of well-drained, open native grassland with a minimum size of 358.3 acres (range = 170 to 776 acres). They have not been observed in areas smaller than 71.6 acres on their breeding grounds (USFWS 2010f).

Sprague's pipits were not observed within the project area during surveys. Native prairie habitat with grasses of intermediate height does occur within the project area. However, the habitat within and surrounding the project area has been previously disturbed by agriculture, roads, and oil and gas development. The proposed project is unlikely to directly affect habitat due to lack of adequate patch sizes required by the Sprague's pipit for breeding grounds in the immediate project area, but may indirectly contribute to reduced use of any nearby suitable grassland habitat patches within 350 meters of the proposed new facilities. Therefore, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** Sprague's pipit.

Pallid Sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus albus*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The pallid sturgeon was listed as Endangered in 1990 in the United States by the USFWS (1990b). The primary factor leading to the decline of this species is the alteration of habitat through river channelization, creation of impoundments, and alteration of flow regimes

(USFWS 1990b). These alterations within the Missouri River have blocked movements to spawning, feeding, and rearing areas, destroyed spawning habitat, altered flow conditions which can delay spawning cues, and reduced food sources by lowering productivity (USFWS 2007a). The fundamental elements of pallid sturgeon habitat are defined as the bottom of swift waters of large, turbid, free-flowing rivers with braided channels, dynamic flow patterns, flooding of terrestrial habitats, and extensive microhabitat diversity (USFWS 1990b).

The pallid sturgeon population which is found near the project area occurs from the Missouri River below Fort Peck Dam to the headwaters of Lake Sakakawea and the lower Yellowstone River up the confluence of the Tongue River, Montana (USFWS 2007a). This population consists of approximately 136 wild adult pallid sturgeon (USFWS 2007a). Hatchery reared sturgeon have also been stocked since 1998. The pallid sturgeon has been found to utilize the 25 km of riverine habitat that would be inundated by Lake Sakakawea at full pool (Bramblett 1996 per USFWS 2007a). Larval pallid sturgeons have also been found to drift into Lake Sakakawea. While the majority of pallid sturgeons are found in the headwaters of Lake Sakakawea, the North Dakota Game and Fish Department has caught and released pallid sturgeon in nets set in 80 to 90 feet of water between the New Town and Van Hook area. Based on this information, pallid sturgeon could be found throughout Lake Sakakawea (personal communication, email from Steve Krentz, Pallid Sturgeon Project Lead, USFWS, to Mike Cook, Aquatic Ecologist, SWCA Environmental Consultants, September 3, 2010).

Potential pollution and sedimentation occurring within the project area are concerns for downstream populations of endangered pallid sturgeon. Suitable habitat for pallid sturgeon does not occur in the project area, and Lake Sakakawea is a minimum of 11.03 river miles from the proposed well pads and access roads. If minor tributaries and/or wooded draws are within 300 feet of proposed project components, secondary containment measures are applied by the BIA to prevent spills. Activities associated with the construction, production, or reclamation of the proposed project area are not anticipated to adversely affect water quality and subsequently the pallid sturgeon. Additionally, a semi-closed-loop drilling system with a dry cuttings pit would be used at the well pad locations. All locations would comply with BIA COAs and spill prevention standards; the interior floor of the drilling pads would be sloped away from drainage ways; and cutting pit liners would be a minimum of 20 millimeters thick. Therefore, the proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** pallid sturgeon.

Dakota Skipper (*Hesperia dactotae*)

Effects Determination: May Affect, Is Not Likely to Adversely Affect

The Dakota skipper is a small butterfly with a 1-inch wingspan and is found primarily in undisturbed native tall grass and upland dry mixed grass prairie areas with a high diversity of wildflowers and grasses (Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada 2003). The Dakota skipper appears to require a range of precipitation-evaporation ratios between 60 and 105 and a soil pH between 7.2 and 7.9 (McCabe 1981). Larvae feed on grasses, favoring little bluestem. Adults commonly feed on nectar of flowering native forbs such as harebell (*Campanula rotundifolia*), wood lily (*Lilium philadelphicum*), and purple coneflower (*Echinacea purpurea*). The species is threatened by conversion of native prairie to cultivated

agriculture or shrublands, over-grazing, invasive species, gravel mining, and inbreeding (USFWS 2005). Dakota skippers are not known to occur within the project area; however, suitable habitat does occur. The proposed project **may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect** this species. The use of best management practices and conservation guidelines (USFWS 2007b) during construction and operation and immediate reclamation of short-term disturbance should decrease direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to this species.

MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT / THE BALD AND GOLDEN EAGLE PROTECTION ACT

Bald Eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*)

Status: Delisted in 2007; protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

Effects of Project: No adverse effects anticipated

Suitable nesting or foraging habitat for bald eagles includes old growth trees relatively close (usually less than 1.24 miles [Hagen et al. 2005]) to perennial water bodies. The project area does not contain old growth trees and the proposed well pads are at least 4.86 straight-line miles from Lake Sakakawea. No eagles or nests were observed within 0.5 mile of the proposed project components during the field surveys. Therefore, no adverse effects are anticipated.

Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*)

Status: Not Listed; protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

Effects of Project: No adverse effects anticipated

No primary or secondary indication of golden eagle presence, including nests, was observed within 0.5 mile of the project area during the field surveys; however, golden eagles may occur within or near the project area. The golden eagle prefers habitat characterized by open prairie, plains, and forested areas. Usually, golden eagles can be found in proximity to badland cliffs which provide suitable nesting habitat. The closest known golden eagle nest (Nest ID GE031) is located a minimum of 3.21 miles from the proposed wells pads. Therefore, no adverse effects are anticipated.

REFERENCES

- Armbruster, M.J. 1990. Characterization of habitat used by whooping cranes during migration. Biological Report 90(4):1-16.
- Bramblett, R.G. 1996. Habitats and movements of pallid and shovelnose sturgeon in the Yellowstone and Missouri Rivers, Montana and North Dakota. Doctoral dissertation. Montana State University, Bozeman.
- Canadian Wildlife Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2007. International Recovery Plan for the Whooping Crane. Ottawa: Recovery of Nationally Endangered Wildlife (RENEW), and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

- Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada. 2003. COSEWIC Assessment and Status Report on the Dakota Skipper *Hesperia dacotae* in Canada. Ottawa: Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada.
- Hagen, S.K., P.T. Isakson, and S.R. Dyke. 2005. North Dakota Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy. North Dakota Game and Fish Department. Bismarck, ND.
- Howe, M.A. 1987. Habitat use by migrating whooping cranes in the Aransas-Wood Buffalo corridor. Pages 303–311, in J.C. Lewis and J.W. Ziewitz, eds. Proc. 1985 Crane Workshop. Platte River Whooping Crane Habitat Maintenance Trust and USFWS, Grand Island, Nebraska.
- . 1989. Migration of Radio-Marked Whooping Cranes from the Aransas-Wood Buffalo Population: Patterns of Habitat Use, Behavior, and Survival. USFWS Technical Report.
- Jones, S.L. 2010. Sprague's pipit (*Anthus spragueii*) conservation plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 56 pp.
- Kotliar, N.B., B.W. Baker, A.D. Whicker, and G. Plumb. 1999. A critical review of assumptions about the prairie dog as a keystone species. *Environmental Management* 24(2):177–192.
- Licht, D.S., and S.H. Fritts. 1994. Gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) occurrences in the Dakotas. *American Midland Naturalist* 132:74–81.
- Licht, D.S., and L.E. Huffman. 1996. Gray wolf status in North Dakota. *The Prairie Naturalist* 28(4):169–174.
- McCabe, T.L. 1981. The Dakota skipper (*Hesperia dacotae*) (Skinner): Range and biology, with special reference to North Dakota. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* 35(3):179–193.
- Root, B.G., M.R. Ryan, and P.M. Mayer. 1992. Piping plover survival in the Great Plains. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 63(1):10–15.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1985a. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: determination of endangered and threatened status for the piping plover. *Federal Register* 50 (238):50726–50734.
- . 1985b. Interior population of the least tern. *Federal Register* 50 FR 21784–21792. May 28, 1985.
- . 1988a. Black-footed Ferret Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Denver, Colorado. 154 pp.
- . 1988b. Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains Piping Plover Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Twin Cities, MN. 160 pp.

- . 1989. Black-footed Ferret Survey Guidelines for Compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Denver and Albuquerque: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- . 1990a. Interior Population of the Least Tern Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Twin Cities, MN. 160 pp.
- . 1990b. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Determination of endangered status for the pallid sturgeon. Federal Register 55(173):36641–36647.
- . 2002. Designation of critical habitat for the northern Great Plains breeding population of the piping plover; final rule. Federal Register. September 11, 2002 (Volume 67, Number 176), Rules and Regulations, pp. 57637–57717.
- . 2005. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; Review of native species that are candidates or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened; Annual notice of findings on resubmitted petitions; Annual description of progress on listing actions; Proposed rule. Federal Register 70(90):24870–24934.
- . 2007a. Pallid Sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus albus*) 5-year Review Summary and Evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Pallid Sturgeon Recovery Coordinator. Billings, Montana.
- . 2007b. Dakota skipper conservation guidelines *Hesperia dacotae* (Skinner) (Lepidoptera: Hesperidae). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Twin Cities Field Office. Available online at <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/insects/dask-cons-guid2007.pdf>. Accessed September 3, 2010.
- . 2010a. Black-footed ferret. Available online at <http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=A004>. Accessed September 7, 2010.
- . 2010b. Gray wolf. Available online at <http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=A00D>. Accessed September 7, 2010.
- . 2010c. Whooping crane. Available online at <http://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B003>. Accessed September 2, 2010.
- . 2010d. Piping plover. Available online at <http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/species/birds/pipingplover>. Accessed September 7, 2010.
- . 2010e. Least tern (interior population). Available online at <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/oklahoma/lestern.htm>. Accessed September 7, 2010.
- . 2010f. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; 12-month finding on a petition to list Sprague’s pipit as endangered or threatened throughout its range. Federal Register 75(178):56028–56050.

APPENDIX B
Natural Resources Soil Descriptions and Attributes

**Part I. NRCS Map Unit Descriptions
(Source: NRCS 2012¹)**

Map unit: 41B - Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes

Component: Williams (60%)

The Williams component comprises 60 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 3 to 6 percent. This component is on rises on till plains. The parent material consists of fine-loamy till. Depth to a root-restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 4 percent. This component is in the R054XY031ND Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 2e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent.

Component: Bowbells (27%)

The Bowbells component comprises 27 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 3 to 6 percent. This component is on swales on till plains. The parent material consists of fine-loamy till. Depth to a root-restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is moderately well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. A seasonal zone of water saturation is at 51 inches during April, May, and June. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 4 percent. This component is in the R054XY023ND Loamy Overflow ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 2e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 20 percent.

Map unit: 42C - Williams loam, 6 to 9 percent slopes

Component: Williams (58%)

The Williams component comprises 58 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 6 to 9 percent. This component is on knolls on till plains. The parent material consists of fine-loamy till. Depth to a root-restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 4 percent. This component is in the R054XY031ND Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 3e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent.

¹ Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2012. Soil Data Mart. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) Database for Dunn and McKenzie Counties, North Dakota. Available online at <http://soildatamart.nrcs.usda.gov>. Accessed March 5, 2012.

Map unit: 44D - Zahl-Williams loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes

Component: Zahl (45%)

The Zahl component comprises 45 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 9 to 15 percent. This component is on hills on till plains. The parent material consists of fine-loamy till. Depth to a root-restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. This component is in the R054XY038ND Thin Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 6e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent.

Component: Williams (21%)

The Williams component comprises 21 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 9 to 15 percent. This component is on hills on till plains. The parent material consists of fine-loamy till. Depth to a root-restrictive layer is greater than 60 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is high. Shrink-swell potential is moderate. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 4 percent. This component is in the R054XY031ND Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 4e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 15 percent.

Map unit: 51C - Amor-Cabba loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes

Component: Amor (39%)

The Amor component comprises 39 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 6 to 9 percent. This component is on hills on uplands. The parent material consists of loamy residuum weathered from mudstone. Depth to a root-restrictive layer, bedrock, paralithic, is 20 to 40 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. This component is in the R054XY031ND Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 3e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 18 percent.

Component: Cabba (29%)

The Cabba component comprises 29 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 6 to 9 percent. This component is on ridges on uplands. The parent material consists of fine-loamy residuum weathered from sedimentary rock. Depth to a root-restrictive layer, bedrock, paralithic, is 10 to 20 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is very low. Shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. This component is in the R054XY030ND Shallow Loamy ecological site. Non-irrigated land

capability classification is 6e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 8 percent. The soil has a slightly sodic horizon within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Map unit: 71C - Regent-Janesburg complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes

Component: Regent (32%)

The Regent component comprises 32 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 6 to 9 percent. This component is on hills on uplands. The parent material consists of clayey residuum weathered from shale. Depth to a root-restrictive layer, bedrock, paralithic, is 20 to 40 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is moderately low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is moderate. Shrink-swell potential is high. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 2 percent. This component is in the R054XY020ND Clayey ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 3e. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 9 percent. The soil has a slightly sodic horizon within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Component: Janesburg (31%)

The Janesburg component comprises 31 percent of the map unit. Slopes are 6 to 9 percent. This component is on hills on uplands. The parent material consists of clayey residuum weathered from shale. Depth to a root-restrictive layer, bedrock, paralithic, is 20 to 40 inches. The natural drainage class is well drained. Water movement in the most restrictive layer is low. Available water to a depth of 60 inches is low. Shrink-swell potential is high. This soil is not flooded and it is not ponded. There is no zone of water saturation within a depth of 72 inches. Organic matter content in the surface horizon is about 3 percent. This component is in the R054XY021ND Claypan ecological site. Non-irrigated land capability classification is 6s. This soil does not meet hydric criteria. The calcium carbonate equivalent within 40 inches, typically, does not exceed 9 percent. The soil has a slightly saline horizon within 30 inches of the soil surface. The soil has a moderately sodic horizon within 30 inches of the soil surface.

Part II. Soil Series within the Project Area

| Map Unit | Survey Area | Soil Series | Landform | Slope | Drainage | Depth (cm) | Restrictive Layer | Carbonate (%) | Organic Matter (%) | Sodium Adsorption Ratio | K Factor | Surface Runoff | Erodibility Rating | Reclamation Potential | Limitation | Ecological Site | Surface Disturbance (acres) | % of Surface Disturbance |
|--------------|-------------|---|------------------|-------|--------------|------------|--------------------|---------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 41B | ND053 | Williams-Bowbells loams, 3 to 6 percent slopes | Plains and rises | 5 | Well drained | >60 | <Null> | 20 | 5.0 | <Null> | 0.28 | Medium | Moderate | Good | <Null> | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | 0.03 | 0.2 |
| 42C | ND053 | Williams loam, 6 to 9 percent slopes | Hills and ridges | 8 | Well drained | >60 | <Null> | 15 | 4.0 | 5 | 0.37 | Medium | Moderate | Good | <Null> | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | 2.46 | 20.4 |
| 44D | ND053 | Zahl-Williams loams, 9 to 15 percent slopes | Hills and ridges | 12 | Well drained | >60 | <Null> | 15 | 2.0 | 5 | 0.37 | Medium | Moderate | Fair | Clay, slope | Thin Loamy (R054XY038ND) | 3.55 | 29.4 |
| 51C | ND053 | Amor-Cabba loams, 6 to 9 percent slopes | Hills and ridges | 8 | Well drained | 10-40 | Paralithic bedrock | 18 | 3.0 | 2 | 0.43 | Medium | Moderate | Poor to fair | Bedrock | Loamy (R054XY031ND) | 2.03 | 16.8 |
| 71C | ND053 | Regent-Janesburg complex, 6 to 9 percent slopes | Hills and ridges | 8 | Well drained | 20-40 | Paralithic bedrock | 9 | 2.0 | 20 | 0.43 | High to very high | Severe | Poor | Bedrock, clay, sodium | Clayey (R054XY020ND) | 4.01 | 33.2 |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 12.08 | 100.0 |

cm = centimeter

APPENDIX C

Consultation and Responses



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, OMAHA DISTRICT
1616 CAPITOL AVENUE
OMAHA NE 68102-4901

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

July 23, 2012

Planning, Programs, and Project Management Division

SWCA Environmental Consultants
Attention: Ms. Laura Leslie Burckhardt
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, Wyoming 82801

Dear Ms. Burckhardt:

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Omaha District (Corps) has reviewed your letter dated June 26, 2012, regarding Enerplus Resource Corporation's proposed development, drilling and completion of four oil and gas wells on one well pad on the Fort Berthold Reservation in McKenzie County, North Dakota. The Corps offers the following comments.

As a member of the Working Group established by Executive Order (EO) #13605 by President Barack Obama, the Departments of Interior and Defense support the safe discovery and development of domestic natural oil and gas resources and have the right to regulate such activities on public and Indian trusts lands. Potential degradation to natural resources and the impact that may have on humans should be considered in order to responsibly develop our oil and gas resources. The Working Group must address other members concerns, including the Corps, to ensure our natural resources and public health and safety is preserved. The Corps requests that full consideration be given in the Environmental Assessment (EA) to the following comments.

The Corps requests the BIA complete a thorough cumulative impact evaluation this action would have when combined with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions regarding oil and gas development on the Fort Berthold Reservation (40 CFR §1508.7). Since August of 2009, the Omaha District has received scoping letters requesting comments on the construction of over 500 wells. Many of these wells are very close to Lake Sakakawea, which is managed by the Corps. From a cumulative impacts perspective, the risk of adverse cumulative impacts to Lake Sakakawea may increase with each well constructed within such a close proximity to the lake. Setting back wells and locating them away from drainages that connect directly to the lake should be considered in the alternative analysis.

The Corps is aware of recent reports that describe environmental impacts associated with the use of open drilling waste pits in North Dakota. These open pits may be susceptible to flooding, which may threaten drinking water supplies, wildlife, soil and other water resources. Due to the proximity of the proposed wells to Lake Sakakawea, a significant drinking water resource, the Corps encourages the applicant to use a complete closed loop drilling system. A complete closed loop drilling system may reduce or eliminate the discharge of toxic drilling wastes and their potential negative impacts to the environment.

The Corps is also aware that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is currently developing a programmatic EA for oil and gas development on the Fort Berthold Reservation. The Corps requests Enerplus Resources Corporation include some information about the programmatic evaluation in the site specific EA. It is important for the reader to know that an overarching analysis is currently underway that will address the scale and rapid development of oil and gas wells within this region.

In order for our office to give you feedback in a timely manner, the Corps requests that you provide location maps with a broader scale. This will help eliminate time spent on searching for proposed project sites. In this case the map provided made it difficult to determine the well location in relation to Lake Sakakawea.

In addition to the comments provided above, it is recommended for Enerplus Resources Corporation to complete the following actions:

a. Your plans should be coordinated with the state water quality office in which the project is located to ensure compliance with federal and state water quality standards and regulations mandated by the Clean Water Act and administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Please coordinate with the North Dakota Department of Health concerning state water quality programs.

b. Consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the North Dakota Game and Fish Department regarding fish and wildlife resources. In addition, the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office should be contacted for information and recommendations on potential cultural resources in the project area.

c. Since the proposed project does not appear to be located within Corps owned or operated lands, we are providing no floodplain or flood risk information. To determine if the proposed project may impact areas designated as a Federal Emergency Management Agency special flood hazard area, please consult the following floodplain management office:

North Dakota State Water Commission
Attention: Jeff Klein
900 East Boulevard Avenue
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505-0850
jjkein@nd.gov
Telephone: 701-328-4898
Fax: 701-328-3747

Finally, any proposed placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States (including jurisdictional wetlands) requires Department of the Army authorization under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. You can visit the Omaha District's Regulatory website for permit applications and related information. Please review the information on the provided website (<http://www.nwo.usace.army.mil/html/od-rnd/ndhome.htm>) to determine if this project requires a 404 permit. For a detailed review of permit requirements, preliminary and final project plans should be sent to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Bismarck Regulatory Office
Attention: CENWO-OD-R-ND/Cimarosti
1513 South 12th Street
Bismarck, North Dakota 58504

I am forwarding a copy of this letter to the Chairman of the Three Affiliated Tribes, Chairman Tex Hall; Three Affiliated Tribes Director of Game and Fish, Mr. Fred Poitra; Three Affiliated Tribes Energy Director, Mr. Fred Fox; Three Affiliated Tribes Natural Resource Director, Ms. Annette Young Bird; Three Affiliated Tribes Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, Mr. Elgin Crows Breast all located at 404 Frontage Road, New Town, North Dakota 58763. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Shannon Sjolie of my staff at (402) 995-2887.

Sincerely,



Randal P. Sellers
Acting Chief, Environmental Resources and Missouri
River Recovery Program Plan Formulation Section



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CORPS OF ENGINEERS, OMAHA DISTRICT
NORTH DAKOTA REGULATORY OFFICE
1513 SOUTH 12TH STREET
BISMARCK ND 58504-6640

June 29, 2012

North Dakota Regulatory Office

SWCA Environmental Consultants
Attn: Laura Leslie Burckhardt
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

Dear Mrs. Burckhardt:

This is in response to your letter dated June 26, 2012 on behalf of Enerplus Resources Corporation, under the National Environmental Policy Act for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Land Management, requesting U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) comments in regards to the development of four exploratory oil and gas wells, located on one well pad located in McKenzie County, North Dakota.

The Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H wells are located in the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 36, Township 149 North, Range 95 West.

Corps Regulatory Offices administer Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (Section 10) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (Section 404). Section 10 regulates work in or affecting navigable waters. This would include work over, through, or under Section 10 waters. Section 10 waters in North Dakota are the Missouri River (including Lake Sakakawea and Lake Oahe), Yellowstone River, James River south of the railroad track in Jamestown, North Dakota, Bois de Sioux River, Red River of the North, and the Upper Des Lacs Lake. Section 404 regulates the discharge of dredge or fill material (temporarily or permanently) in waters of the United States. Waters of the United States may include, but is not limited to, rivers, streams, ditches, coulees, lakes, ponds, and their adjacent wetlands. Fill material includes, but is not limited to, rock, sand, soil, clay, plastics, construction debris, wood chips, overburden from mines or other excavation activities and materials used to create any structure or infrastructure in waters of the United States.

For any proposed well where the well line and/or bottom hole is under or crosses under Lake Sakakawea, regardless of depth, we require that project proponent submit a completed permit application (ENG Form 4345) to the Corps. Include a location map and description of all work associated with the proposal, i.e., well bore, road construction, utility lines, etc. Send the completed application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; North Dakota Regulatory Office; 1513 South 12th Street; Bismarck, North Dakota; 58504.

If we can be of further assistance or should you have any questions regarding our program, please do not hesitate to contact this office by letter or phone at (701) 255-0015.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sam Werner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Sam" being more prominent.

Sam Werner
Acting Regulatory Program Manager
North Dakota

Enclosure
ENG Form 4345

CF w/o encl
EPA Denver (Brent Truskowski)

**Instructions for Preparing a
Department of the Army Permit Application**

Blocks 1 through 4. To be completed by Corps of Engineers.

Block 5. Applicant's Name. Enter the name and the E-mail address of the responsible party or parties. If the responsible party is an agency, company, corporation, or other organization, indicate the name of the organization and responsible officer and title. If more than one party is associated with the application, please attach a sheet with the necessary information marked Block 5.

Block 6. Address of Applicant. Please provide the full address of the party or parties responsible for the application. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 6.

Block 7. Applicant Telephone Number(s). Please provide the number where you can usually be reached during normal business hours.

Blocks 8 through 11. To be completed, if you choose to have an agent.

Block 8. Authorized Agent's Name and Title. Indicate name of individual or agency, designated by you, to represent you in this process. An agent can be an attorney, builder, contractor, engineer, or any other person or organization. Note: An agent is not required.

Blocks 9 and 10. Agent's Address and Telephone Number. Please provide the complete mailing address of the agent, along with the telephone number where he / she can be reached during normal business hours.

Block 11. Statement of Authorization. To be completed by applicant, if an agent is to be employed.

Block 12. Proposed Project Name or Title. Please provide name identifying the proposed project, e.g., Landmark Plaza, Burned Hills Subdivision, or Edsall Commercial Center.

Block 13. Name of Waterbody. Please provide the name of any stream, lake, marsh, or other waterway to be directly impacted by the activity. If it is a minor (no name) stream, identify the waterbody the minor stream enters.

Block 14. Proposed Project Street Address. If the proposed project is located at a site having a street address (not a box number), please enter it here.

Block 15. Location of Proposed Project. Enter the latitude and longitude of where the proposed project is located. If more space is required, please attach a sheet with the necessary information marked Block 15.

Block 16. Other Location Descriptions. If available, provide the Tax Parcel Identification number of the site, Section, Township, and Range of the site (if known), and / or local Municipality that the site is located in.

Block 17. Directions to the Site. Provide directions to the site from a known location or landmark. Include highway and street numbers as well as names. Also provide distances from known locations and any other information that would assist in locating the site. You may also provide description of the proposed project location, such as lot numbers, tract numbers, or you may choose to locate the proposed project site from a known point (such as the right descending bank of Smith Creek, one mile downstream from the Highway 14 bridge). If a large river or stream, include the river mile of the proposed project site if known.

Block 18. Nature of Activity. Describe the overall activity or project. Give appropriate dimensions of structures such as wing walls, dikes (identify the materials to be used in construction, as well as the methods by which the work is to be done), or excavations (length, width, and height). Indicate whether discharge of dredged or fill material is involved. Also, identify any structure to be constructed on a fill, piles, or float-supported platforms.

The written descriptions and illustrations are an important part of the application. Please describe, in detail, what you wish to do. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 18.

Block 19. Proposed Project Purpose. Describe the purpose and need for the proposed project. What will it be used for and why? Also include a brief description of any related activities to be developed as the result of the proposed project. Give the approximate dates you plan to both begin and complete all work.

Block 20. Reasons for Discharge. If the activity involves the discharge of dredged and/or fill material into a wetland or other waterbody, including the temporary placement of material, explain the specific purpose of the placement of the material (such as erosion control).

Block 21. Types of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards. Describe the material to be discharged and amount of each material to be discharged within Corps jurisdiction. Please be sure this description will agree with your illustrations. Discharge material includes: rock, sand, clay, concrete, etc.

Block 22. Surface Areas of Wetlands or Other Waters Filled. Describe the area to be filled at each location. Specifically identify the surface areas, or part thereof, to be filled. Also include the means by which the discharge is to be done (backhoe, dragline, etc.). If dredged material is to be discharged on an upland site, identify the site and the steps to be taken (if necessary) to prevent runoff from the dredged material back into a waterbody. If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 22.

Block 23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation. Provide a brief explanation describing how impacts to waters of the United States are being avoided and minimized on the project site. Also provide a brief description of how impacts to waters of the United States will be compensated for, or a brief statement explaining why compensatory mitigation should not be required for those impacts.

Block 24. Is Any Portion of the Work Already Complete? Provide any background on any part of the proposed project already completed. Describe the area already developed, structures completed, any dredged or fill material already discharged, the type of material, volume in cubic yards, acres filled, if a wetland or other waterbody (in acres or square feet). If the work was done under an existing Corps permit, identify the authorization, if possible.

Block 25. Names and Addresses of Adjoining Property Owners, Lessees, etc., Whose Property Adjoins the Project Site. List complete names and full mailing addresses of the adjacent property owners (public and private) lessees, etc., whose property adjoins the waterbody or aquatic site where the work is being proposed so that they may be notified of the proposed activity (usually by public notice). If more space is needed, attach an extra sheet of paper marked Block 24.

Information regarding adjacent landowners is usually available through the office of the tax assessor in the county or counties where the project is to be developed.

Block 26. Information about Approvals or Denials by Other Agencies. You may need the approval of other federal, state, or local agencies for your project. Identify any applications you have submitted and the status, if any (approved or denied) of each application. You need not have obtained all other permits before applying for a Corps permit.

Block 27. Signature of Applicant or Agent. The application must be signed by the owner or other authorized party (agent). This signature shall be an affirmation that the party applying for the permit possesses the requisite property rights to undertake the activity applied for (including compliance with special conditions, mitigation, etc.).

DRAWINGS AND ILLUSTRATIONS

General Information.

Three types of illustrations are needed to properly depict the work to be undertaken. These illustrations or drawings are identified as a Vicinity Map, a Plan View or a Typical Cross-Section Map. Identify each illustration with a figure or attachment number.

Please submit one original, or good quality copy, of all drawings on 8½ x11 inch plain white paper (electronic media may be substituted). Use the fewest number of sheets necessary for your drawings or illustrations.

Each illustration should identify the project, the applicant, and the type of illustration (vicinity map, plan view, or cross-section). **While illustrations need not be professional (many small, private project illustrations are prepared by hand), they should be clear, accurate, and contain all necessary information.**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Region VIII
Denver Federal Center, Building 710
P.O. Box 25267
Denver, CO 80225-0267



FEMA

R8-Mitigation

June 27, 2012

SWCA

Ms. Laura Leslie Burckhardt
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

Dear Ms. Burckhardt:

Thank you for your inquiry regarding your proposed projects, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Reel #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod # 149-95-36D TF, in McKenzie County, ND. FEMA's major concern is if the property is located within a mapped Special Flood Hazard Area any development in these areas requires further consideration.

I recommend that you contact the local Floodplain Manager for McKenzie County Mr. Roger Chinn at (701) 863-6604 to receive further guidelines regarding the impact that the project might have to the regulations and policies of the National Flood Insurance Program. It is essential that a Floodplain Ordinance Permit be issued prior to this project being started. Considering that floods are the most devastating of all natural disasters in this country, any efforts to reduce the impacts of that hazard is worthwhile.

Let me know if I can be of assistance and please feel free to contact me at 303-235-4721.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Kyner", written over a horizontal line.

David A. Kyner
NFIP Program Specialist



ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

Sound Science. Creative Solutions.

Sheridan Office
1692 South Sheridan Ave.
Sheridan, WY 82801
Tel 307.673.4303 Fax 307.673.4505
www.swca.com

June 27, 2012

Jeffrey K. Towner
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
3425 Miriam Avenue
Bismarck, ND 58501

RE: Request for Concurrence Letter

Dear Mr. Towner,

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is preparing an environmental assessment (EA) under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). The proposed action (the Project) includes approval by the BIA and BLM for the construction, drilling, completion, and production of six exploratory oil and gas wells, located on two well pads, on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation (the Reservation) by Enerplus Resources (USA) Corporation (Enerplus). The proposed surface locations are listed below and illustrated in Figures 1 and 2.

- The Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF wells would be located on a shared pad in the NE¼ SE¼ Section 36, Township (T) 149 North (N), Range (R) 95 West (W), McKenzie County, North Dakota (Figure 1). These wells would be located within a 1,280-acre spacing unit.
- The Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF wells would be located on a shared pad in the NE¼ NW¼ Section 19, T152N, R94W, McKenzie County, North Dakota (Figure 2). These wells would be located within a 640-acre spacing unit.

The associated facilities required by the Project would include roads, utility lines, production facilities (production tanks), radio towers, and equipment storage facilities. Enerplus also proposes to construct and install oil, gas, and water gathering pipelines and underground electrical lines along the proposed access roads from the well pads to existing state highways and BIA and county roads that provide access to the project area. Enerplus would use existing roads and previous disturbances to the greatest extent practicable. Existing highways and arterial roads would provide the main access to the project area, which is located in T149N, R95W, and T152N, R94W, as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Project development would result in the construction of approximately 625 feet (0.12 mile) of new or upgraded/improved roads to access the well pads. The proposed roads and utility rights-of-ways (ROWs) would not exceed a width of 66 feet and would result in approximately 0.85 acre of short-term disturbance and 0.97 acre of long-term disturbance, as shown in Table 1.


U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
ECOLOGICAL SERVICES
ND FIELD OFFICE

Project as described will have no significant impact on fish and wildlife resources. No endangered or threatened species are known to occupy the project area and/or are not likely to be adversely affected. IF PROJECT DESIGN CHANGES ARE MADE, PLEASE SUBMIT PLANS FOR REVIEW.

| | |
|---------|---------------------------------------|
| 7-16-12 | <i>Jeffrey K. Towner</i> |
| Date | Jeffrey K. Towner Field Supervisor |

Mr. Jeffrey Towner
June 27, 2012
Page 21

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Wade Epperson". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Wade Epperson

Enclosures: Attachment 1



NORTH DAKOTA
DEPARTMENT of HEALTH

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SECTION
Gold Seal Center, 918 E. Divide Ave.
Bismarck, ND 58501-1947
701.328.5200 (fax)
www.ndhealth.gov



July 3, 2012

Ms. Laura Leslie Burckhardt
Natural Resources Lead
SWCA Environmental Consultants
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

Re: Four Proposed Oil and Gas Wells on One Well Pad by Enerplus Resources Corp.
Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF and
Rod #149-95-36D-25H, Ft. Berthold Indian Reservation, McKenzie County, North Dakota

Dear Ms. Burckhardt:

This department has reviewed the information concerning the above-referenced project submitted under date of June 26, 2012, with respect to possible environmental impacts.

This department believes that environmental impacts from the proposed construction will be minor and can be controlled by proper construction methods. With respect to construction, we have the following comments:

1. Development of the production facilities and any access roads, well pads or pipelines should have a minimal effect on air quality provided measures are taken to minimize fugitive dust. However, operation of the wells has the potential to release air contaminants capable of causing or contributing to air pollution. We encourage the development and operation of the wells in a manner that is consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. Detailed guidance is available at www.ndhealth.gov/AQ/OilAndGasWells.htm.

Any questions about air pollution control or permitting requirements should be addressed to Ms. Kathleen Paser at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8. She may be reached at (303) 312-6526 or Paser.Kathleen@epa.gov.

2. Care is to be taken during construction activity near any water of the state to minimize adverse effects on a water body. This includes minimal disturbance of stream beds and banks to prevent excess siltation, and the replacement and revegetation of any disturbed area as soon as possible after work has been completed. Caution must also be taken to prevent spills of oil and grease that may reach the receiving water from equipment maintenance, and/or the handling of fuels on the site. Guidelines for minimizing degradation to waterways during construction are attached.
3. Oil and gas related construction activities located within tribal boundaries in North Dakota may be required to obtain a permit to discharge storm water runoff from the U.S. Environmental Protection

Environmental Health
Section Chief's Office
701.328.5150

Division of
Air Quality
701.328.5188

Division of
Municipal Facilities
701.328.5211

Division of
Waste Management
701.328.5166

Division of
Water Quality
701.328.5210

Agency. Further information may be obtained from the U.S. EPA's website or by calling the U.S. EPA – Region 8 at (303) 312-6312. Also, cities or counties may impose additional requirements and/or specific best management practices for construction affecting their storm drainage system. Check with the local officials to be sure any local storm water management considerations are addressed.

4. Projects that involve construction, drilling, completion and/or production of crude oil or natural gas wells should select locations that minimize the potential for environmental damage during development of the well and in the event of a spill; restrict fluids from reaching surface waters. Well placement should avoid close proximity to drainage areas and steep slopes. Environmental damage can be reduced by developing a spill response plan that emphasizes rapid deployment of prepositioned assets necessary to contain spills and subsequent cleanup. Proper surveillance and monitoring of pipelines is necessary for the early detection of leaks.

The department owns no land in or adjacent to the proposed improvements, nor does it have any projects scheduled in the area. In addition, we believe the proposed activities are consistent with the State Implementation Plan for the Control of Air Pollution for the State of North Dakota.

These comments are based on the information provided about the project in the above-referenced submittal. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may require a water quality certification from this department for the project if the project is subject to their Section 404 permitting process. Any additional information which may be required by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the process will be considered by this department in our determination regarding the issuance of such a certification.

If you have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,



L. David Glatt, P.E., Chief
Environmental Health Section

LDG:cc
Attach.



Construction and Environmental Disturbance Requirements

These represent the minimum requirements of the North Dakota Department of Health. They ensure that minimal environmental degradation occurs as a result of construction or related work which has the potential to affect the waters of the State of North Dakota. All projects will be designed and implemented to restrict the losses or disturbances of soil, vegetative cover, and pollutants (chemical or biological) from a site.

Soils

Prevent the erosion of exposed soil surfaces and trapping sediments being transported. Examples include, but are not restricted to, sediment dams or berms, diversion dikes, hay bales as erosion checks, riprap, mesh or burlap blankets to hold soil during construction, and immediately establishing vegetative cover on disturbed areas after construction is completed. Fragile and sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, delicate flora, or land resources will be protected against compaction, vegetation loss, and unnecessary damage.

Surface Waters

All construction which directly or indirectly impacts aquatic systems will be managed to minimize impacts. All attempts will be made to prevent the contamination of water at construction sites from fuel spillage, lubricants, and chemicals, by following safe storage and handling procedures. Stream bank and stream bed disturbances will be controlled to minimize and/or prevent silt movement, nutrient upsurges, plant dislocation, and any physical, chemical, or biological disruption. The use of pesticides or herbicides in or near these systems is forbidden without approval from this Department.

Fill Material

Any fill material placed below the high water mark must be free of top soils, decomposable materials, and persistent synthetic organic compounds (in toxic concentrations). This includes, but is not limited to, asphalt, tires, treated lumber, and construction debris. The Department may require testing of fill materials. All temporary fills must be removed. Debris and solid wastes will be removed from the site and the impacted areas restored as nearly as possible to the original condition.



"VARIETY IN HUNTING AND FISHING"

NORTH DAKOTA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

100 NORTH BISMARCK EXPRESSWAY BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA 58501-5095 PHONE 701-328-6300 FAX 701-328-6352

July 19, 2012

Laura Leslie Bureckhardt
Natural Resources Lead
SWCA Environmental Consultants
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

Dear Ms. Bureckhardt:

RE: Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF,
& Rod #149-95-36D-25H
Racer #152-94-19B & Garter #152-94-19BH TF

Enerplus Resources Corporation is proposing six exploratory oil and gas wells on two well pads on the Fort Berthold Reservation in McKenzie County, North Dakota.

Our primary concern with oil and gas development is the fragmentation and loss of wildlife habitat associated with construction of the well pads and access roads. We recommend that construction be avoided to the extent possible within native prairie, wooded draws, riparian corridors, and wetland areas.

We also suggest that botanical surveys be completed during the appropriate season and aerial surveys be conducted for raptor nests before construction begins.

Sincerely,

(for) Greg Link
Chief
Conservation & Communication Division

js



STATE
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY
OF NORTH DAKOTA

Jack Dalrymple
Governor of North Dakota

North Dakota
State Historical Board

Gerold Gerntholz
Valley City - President

Calvin Grinnell
New Town - Vice President

A. Ruric Todd III
Janestown -- Secretary

Albert I. Berger
Grand Forks

Diane K. Larson
Bismarck

Chester E. Nelson, Jr.
Bismarck

Margaret Puetz
Bismarck

Sara Otte Coleman
Director
Tourism Division

Kelly Schmidt
State Treasurer

Alvin A. Jaeger
Secretary of State

Mark Zimmerman
Director
Parks and Recreation
Department

Francis Ziegler
Director
Department of Transportation

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
Director

Accredited by the
American Association
of Museums since 1986

July 10, 2012

Ms. Laura L. Burckhardt
SWCA
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan WY 82801

ND SHPO REF. 12-1287 BIA/BLM/MHAN THPO Enerplus Resources
Corp Four oil well pads in portions of [T149N R95W Section 36 NE SE]
The Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF
The Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H
Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF
Rod #149-95-36D-25H in McKenzie County, North Dakota

Dear Ms. Burckhardt,

We received your correspondence regarding ND SHPO REF. 12-1287
BIA/BLM/MHAN THPO Enerplus Resources Corp Four oil well pads in
McKenzie County, as detailed above. We request that a copy of cultural
resource site forms and reports be sent to this office so that the cultural
resources archives can be kept current for researchers.

Thank you for your consideration. Consultation is with MHAN THPO. If you
have any questions please contact Susan Quinnell, Review & Compliance
Coordinator at (701)328-3576 or squinnell@nd.gov

Sincerely,

Merlan E. Paaverud, Jr.
State Historic Preservation Officer (North Dakota)

c: Elgin Crows Breast, THPO MHAN
c: Justin Peters, BLM, Dickinson, ND

United States Department of Agriculture



Natural Resources Conservation Service
P.O. Box 1458
Bismarck, ND 58502-1458

July 20, 2012

Laura Leslie Burckhardt
SWCA Environmental Consultants
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

RE: The Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H,
Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H Wells
McKenzie County, ND

Dear Ms. Burckhardt:

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has reviewed your letter dated June 26, 2012, concerning the development of the Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF, and Rod #149-95-36D-25H wells in McKenzie County, North Dakota.

NRCS has a major responsibility with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) in documenting conversion of farmland (i.e., prime, statewide, and local importance) to non-agricultural use. It appears your proposed project is not supported by federal funding; therefore, FPPA does not apply and no further action is needed.

Wetlands – The Wetland Conservation Provisions of the 1985 Food Security Act, as amended, provide that if a USDA participant converts a wetland for the purpose of, or to have the effect of, making agricultural production possible, loss of USDA benefits could occur. NRCS has developed the following guidelines for the installation of buried utilities. If these guidelines are followed, the impacts to the wetland(s) will be considered minimal allowing USDA participants to continue to receive USDA benefits. Following are the requirements: 1) Disturbance to the wetland(s) must be temporary, 2) no drainage of the wetland(s) is allowed (temporary or permanent), 3) mechanized landscaping necessary for installation is kept to a minimum and preconstruction contours are maintained, 4) temporary side cast material must be placed in such a manner not to be dispersed in the wetland, and 5) all trenches must be backfilled to the original wetland bottom elevation.

Helping People Help the Land

An Equal Opportunity Provider and Employer

Ms. Burckhardt
Page 2

NRCS would recommend that impacts to wetlands be avoided. If the alignment of the project requires passage through a wetland, NRCS can complete a certified wetland determination, if requested by the landowner/operator.

If you have additional questions pertaining to FPPA, please contact Steve Sieler, State Soil Liaison, at (701) 530-2019.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "W. D. Bott". The signature is stylized with a large, looped "W" and a "D" that is partially obscured by the "W".

WADE D. BOTT
State Soil Scientist



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Dakotas Area Office
P.O. Box 1017

Bismarck, North Dakota 58502

AUG 6 2012

IN REPLY, REFER TO:
DK-5000
ENV-6.00

Laura Leslie Burckhardt
SWCA Environmental Consultants
1892 South Sheridan Avenue
Sheridan, WY 82801

Subject: Solicitation for an Environmental Assessment by BIA and BLM for the Proposed Construction of Four Oil and Gas Wells on One Well-Pad, for Enerplus Resources on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation in McKenzie County, North Dakota

Dear Ms. Burckhardt:

This letter is written to inform you that we received your June 26, 2012, letter, and the information and maps of your proposed well pad and wells have been reviewed by Bureau of Reclamation staff.

The proposed well pad is proposed for:

SE¼ sec. 36, T. 149 N., R. 95 W., Figure 4 Ranch, ND quadrangle, McKenzie County

There are Federal Reclamation facilities, municipal, rural, and industrial water lines of the Fort Berthold Reservation rural water system, in or adjacent to section 36, T149N, R95W. Please take note that municipal, rural, and industrial water lines (red lines) commonly follow roads, as in this case. In particular, the water line is on the same side of the road as your proposed project and your access road crosses the pipeline alignment. Please refer to our map and picture of the area on page 2.

Should you need to cross a Fort Berthold Rural Water System pipeline while accessing your proposed project or should you need to relocate a Rural Water System pipeline, please contact our engineer Tom Thompson, as Reclamation requests that you provide us an opportunity to review the designs for any relocations or crossings of Federal Fort Berthold Rural Water lines.

Since Reclamation is the lead federal agency for the Fort Berthold Rural Water System, we request that any work planned on the reservation be coordinated with the Fort Berthold Rural Water Director, Three Affiliated Tribes, 308 4 Bears Complex, New Town, North Dakota 58763. Further, Tom Thompson will be your Reclamation engineering contact. For your convenience, we have included our specifications sheet for pipeline crossings as an initial example.



Thank you for providing your project information and the opportunity to comment on your proposal. If you have any further environmental questions, please contact me at 701-221-1287 or for engineering questions Tom Thompson, Civil Engineer, at 701-221-1220.



Sincerely,


Kelly B. McPhillips
Environmental Specialist

Enclosure

cc: Bureau of Indian Affairs
Great Plains Regional Office
Ms. Marilyn Bercier
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist
115 Fourth Avenue S.E.
Aberdeen, SD 57401

Fort Berthold Rural Water Director
Three Affiliated Tribes
308 4 Bears Complex
New Town, ND 58763
(w/encl)




NOTES

1. Drawing is not to scale.
2. Concrete forms are minimum for all conditions.
3. Any additional permits needed/needed for construction and be provided by the Contractor.
4. Overhead structures elements shown are for 120 degree F and 150 windshft sps.
5. Erosion control measures, including re-vegetation, shall be implemented after completing construction activities.
6. The applicant will submit a project description, and detailed construction phase activity plan (area, period and sections) and grading plans of proposed work with Reclamation's approval (if any).
7. The applicant shall submit preliminary, excavation plan, and setbacks for existing site.
8. All the completion of construction activities, the applicant shall submit AS-BUILT drawings that indicate the horizontal and vertical components of all utilities in areas affected during construction with Reclamation's approval.
9. Applicant complete hazardous materials or pollutants (i.e., oil, gasoline, natural gas, petroleum water and hydrocarbon water, etc.) shall be designed for a reduced risk of contamination to the receiving water body.
10. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a. A detailed plan of proposed work with an additional 20 percent working pressure factor.
 - b. The accuracy of the plan shall be at least 1/8 inch for all horizontal and vertical dimensions.
 - c. All work within 18 inches of the facility must be done using hand-held tools only. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - d. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - e. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - f. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - g. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - h. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - i. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - j. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - k. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - l. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - m. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - n. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - o. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - p. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - q. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - r. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - s. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - t. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - u. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - v. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - w. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - x. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - y. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
 - z. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
11. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
12. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.
13. The applicant shall submit a detailed plan of proposed work with Reclamation's approval.

DETECTABLE WARNING TAPE

- A. For potable water lines, the warning tape shall be a 3-inch-wide white detectable tape impregnated with "CAUTION BURNED POTABLE WATER LINE".
- B. For non-potable water lines, the warning tape shall be a 3-inch-wide white detectable tape impregnated with "CAUTION BURNED NON-POTABLE WATER LINE".
- C. For gas, oil, and steam chemical lines, the warning tape shall be a 3-inch-wide white detectable tape impregnated with "CAUTION BURNED (GAS) LINE".
- D. For telecommunications, telephone, television, computer, and other data lines, the warning tape shall be a 3-inch-wide white detectable tape impregnated with "CAUTION BURNED TELECOMMUNICATIONS LINE".
- E. For electrical power lines, the warning tape shall be a 3-inch-wide white detectable tape impregnated with "CAUTION BURNED ELECTRICAL LINE".
- F. A marker sign shall be provided that shows the clearance and electrical line location. The warning sign shall be located in the trench and shall indicate, HIGH VOLTAGE OVERHEAD.



VOLTAGE



CROSSING FLAY



OVERHEAD CROSSING



UNDERGROUND CROSSINGS



TYPICAL SECTION POTABLE OR RAW WATER PIPELINE CROSSING



ONE SET LENGTH OF PIPE SHALL BE LOCATED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE CROSSING TO ALLOW FOR POTABLE OR RAW WATER INFILTRATION AS POSSIBLE.

Reclamation
MARI RURAL WATER SYSTEMS
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES
POTABLE AND RAW WATER PIPELINES

760-603-25480
SHEET 1 OF 1



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Great Plains Regional Office
115 Fourth Avenue S.E., Suite 400
Aberdeen, South Dakota 57401

JUL 16 2012

IN REPLY REFER TO:
DESCRM
MC-208

Elgin Crows Breast, THPO
Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation
404 Frontage Road
New Town, North Dakota 58763

Dear Mr. Crows Breast:

We have considered the potential effects on cultural resources of a multiple oil well pad in McKenzie County, North Dakota. Approximately 20.1 acres were intensively inventoried using a pedestrian methodology. Potential surface disturbances are not expected to exceed the area depicted in the enclosed report. One previously recorded archaeological site (32MZ936) was further evaluated via 154 shovel tests that demonstrated that the site possesses the quality of integrity and meets at least one of the criteria (36 C.F.R. § 60.4) so as to be **eligible** for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The record for site 32MZ936 has been updated. No properties were located that appear to qualify for protection under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. § 1996 [1994]).

As the surface management agency, and as provided for in 36 C.F.R. § 800.5 (2005), we have therefore reached a determination of **no adverse effect** for this undertaking, as the well pad project has been moved so as to avoid site 32MZ936. Catalogued as **BIA Case Number AAO-2090/FB/12**, the proposed undertaking, location, and project dimensions are described in the following report:

Schleicher, Jolene, and Adam Leroy

(2012) A Class I and Class III Cultural Resource Inventory and Evaluative Shovel Testing of 32MZ936 for the Enerplus Ruby 148-95-3B-10H TF, Sapphire 148-95-3B-10H, Rod 148-95-36D-25H and Reel 148-95-36D-25H TF Well Pad, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, McKenzie County, North Dakota. SWCA Environmental Consultants for Enerplus Resources, Denver.

If your office concurs with this determination, consultation will be completed under the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations. We will adhere to the Standard Conditions of Compliance.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Carson N. Murdy, Regional Archaeologist, at (605) 226-7656.

Sincerely,

Acting


Regional Director

Enclosure

cc: Chairman, Three Affiliated Tribes
Superintendent, Fort Berthold Agency



United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Great Plains Regional Office
115 Fourth Avenue S.E., Suite 400
Aberdeen, South Dakota 57401

IN REPLY REFER TO:
DESCRM
MC-208

JUL 16 2012

Elgin Crows Breast, THPO
Mandan, Hidatsa and Arikara Nation
404 Frontage Road
New Town, North Dakota 58763

Dear Mr. Crows Breast:

We have considered the potential effects on cultural resources of a well pad and access road in Dunn County, North Dakota. Approximately 26.74 acres were intensively inventoried using a pedestrian methodology. Potential surface disturbances are not expected to exceed the area depicted in the enclosed report. No historic properties were located that appear to possess the quality of integrity and meet at least one of the criteria (36 C.F.R. § 60.4) for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. No properties were located that appear to qualify for protection under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 U.S.C. § 1996 [1994]).

As the surface management agency, and as provided for in 36 C.F.R. § 800.5 (2005), we therefore have reached a determination of **no historic properties affected** for this undertaking. Catalogued as **BIA Case Number AAO-3015/FB/12**, the proposed undertaking, location, and project dimensions are described in the following report:

Schleicher, Jolene

(2012) A Class I and Class III Cultural Resources Inventory of the Enerplus Resources Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF Well Pad and Access Road/Utility Corridor, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, Dunn County, North Dakota. SWCA Environmental Consultants for Enerplus Resources, Denver.

If your office concurs with this determination, consultation will be completed under the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations. We will adhere to the Standard Conditions of Compliance.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Carson N. Murdy, Regional Archaeologist, at (605) 226-7656.

Sincerely,

Acting

Regional Director

Enclosure

cc: Chairman, Three Affiliated Tribes
Superintendent, Fort Berthold Agency

Notice of Availability and Appeal Rights

**Enerplus: Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads-
Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF
Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF**

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is planning to issue administrative approvals related to Six Exploratory Bakken and Three Forks Oil Wells Located on Two Well Pads: Racer #152-94-19B and Garter #152-94-19BH TF Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H, Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF, Rod #149-95-36D-25H, and Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF on the Berthold Reservation as shown on the attached map. Construction by Enerplus Resources is expected to begin in 2012.


An environmental assessment (EA) determined that proposed activities will not cause significant impacts to the human environment. An environmental impact statement is not required. Contact Earl Silk, Superintendent at 701-627-6570 for more information and/or copies of the EA and the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

The FONSI is only a finding on environmental impacts – it is not a decision to proceed with an action and *cannot* be appealed. BIA's decision to proceed with administrative actions *can* be appealed until October 12, 2012, by contacting:

**United States Department of the Interior
Office of Hearings and Appeals
Interior Board of Indian Appeals
801 N. Quincy Street, Suite 300, Arlington, Va 22203.**


Procedural details are available from the BIA Fort Berthold Agency at 701-627-6570.

Project locations.



Legend

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|
|  | Proposed Well Location | Proposed Well Pad |
|  | Proposed Access Road |  Racer #152-94-19B |
|  | Proposed 66-foot Utility Corridor | Garter #152-94-19BH TF |
|  | Existing Road | |




Scale 1:18,000 1 Inch = 1,500 Feet
 Projection NAD 1983 UTM Zone 13N
 McKenzie County, North Dakota



Date 7/23/2012

Created By
 SWCA Environmental Consultants



Legend

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
|  | Proposed Well Location |  | Proposed Well Pad |
|  | Proposed Access Road | | Ruby #148-95-3B-10H TF |
|  | Proposed 66-foot Utility Corridor | | Sapphire #148-95-3B-10H |
|  | Existing Road | | Reel #149-95-36D-25H TF |
| | | | Rod #149-95-36D-25H |

750 375 0 Feet 750 1500

225 112.5 0 Meters 225 450

Scale 1:18,000 1 Inch = 1,500 Feet
 Projection NAD 1983 UTM Zone 13N
 McKenzie County, North Dakota

Date 7/23/2012



Created By
 SWCA Environmental Consultants

