

Sensitive Area Determination Checklist

TEP Rocky Mountain, LLC		
Person(s) Conducting Field Inspection	None Conducted	
Site Information		
Location:	SG 32-26	Time:
Type of Facility:	Existing Well Pad w/ Proposed Expansion	
Environmental Conditions	N/A	
Temperature (°F)	N/A	

Has the proposed, new or existing location been designated as a sensitive area?

☐ Yes ☒ No

SURFACE WATER

1. Are there any surface water features or SWSAs adjacent to or within ¼ mile of the proposed/new or existing facility?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, list type of surface water feature(s), i.e. rivers, creeks, streams, seeps, springs, wetlands:

If yes, describe location relative to facility:

2. Could a potential release from the facility reach surface water features?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, describe the pathway a release from the facility would likely follow to determine if the potential to impact surface water is high or low.

3. Is the potential to impact surface water from a facility release high or low?

☐ High ☒ Low

GROUNDWATER

1. Will the proposed/new or existing facility have any pits which will contain hydrocarbons and chlorides or other E&P wastes?
☒ Yes ☐ No
If yes, List the pit type(s): Cuttings trench on the northwest side
2. Is the site of the proposed facility underlain by an unconfined aquifer or recharge zone?
☒ Yes ☐ No
3. Is the hydraulic conductivity of the underlying soil or geologic material $\leq 1.0 \times 10^{-7}$ cm/sec?
☐ Yes ☒ No
4. Is the proposed facility located within 1/8 mile of a domestic water well or 1/4 mile of a public water supply well which would use the same aquifer?
☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Is the proposed facility located within a 100 year floodplain?
☐ Yes (*Sensitive Area*) ☒ No (*If no, proceed to question #6.*)
6. Is the depth to groundwater known?
☐ Yes (*If yes, follow instructions provided in 6(a) of this section.*)
☒ No (*If no, follow instructions provided in 6(b) of this section.*)
 - (a) If yes, could a potential release from the proposed facility reach groundwater?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If yes, explain:
 - (b) If no:
 - (i) Evaluate surrounding soils, topography, and vegetation which may suggest the presence of shallow groundwater.
 - (ii) Gather information from surrounding well data in order to determine a depth to groundwater, i.e. State Engineers Office.
7. Is the potential to impact ground water from the facility in the event of a release high or low?
☐ High ☒ Low

Additional Comments:

As stated in the surface water portion of this sensitive area determination, there are no USGS identified drainage features located within a ¼ mile of the proposed facility. The facility, as it is currently proposed to be expanded, limits the direction of a potential release to the northeastern side. If a potential release were to migrate off the facility on this side, flow would be to the northeast onto the flat lying reclaimed portion of the original facility disturbance. There are currently well constructed Best Management Practices (BMP's) on the non-reclaimed portion of the facility. These are in the form of a large earthen berm on the northwestern side and a earthen perimeter berm on the northeastern side. The proposed facility expansion will eliminate the large earthen berm on the northwestern side. However the cuttings trench would capture any fluids from a potential release should it migrate, on-site, to the northwest. An earthen perimeter berm should be installed on the northeastern and southwestern sides which should ensure total site containment, due to the flat lying terrain, in the event of a potential release. All newly constructed BMPs should be monitored and maintained to ensure containment of a potential release on site.

The State Engineers Office and USGS records were reviewed and there is one permitted water well within ¼ mile of the existing facility. The well is located 1,231 feet to the north with a noted depth to groundwater of 43 feet. Based on aerial photography review, the vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the proposed facility consists of juniper, sage, and bunch grasses and does not suggest the presence of shallow groundwater less than that noted in the above noted well. The approximate elevation of the existing facility is 5,077 feet and the elevation of the above noted water well is approximately 5,037 feet. With the difference in ground elevation and the noted depth to groundwater it could be assumed that the depth to groundwater would be approximately 80 feet if not greater.

Based on the information collected during this desktop review, the potential to impact groundwater would be deemed as low. The potential to impact any surface water features would be deemed to be low as well due to the flat lying terrain and man-made modification to the land surface which has eliminated any surface drainage features. With the potential for impacts to both surface water and groundwater being deemed as low, the proposed facility can be designated as being in a non-sensitive area.

Inspector Signature(s):  Date: 2/22/2018

Mark E. Mumby, *Env. Program Manager/RPG*
HRL Compliance Solutions, Inc.