

Sensitive Area Determination Checklist

| TEP Rocky Mountain, LLC | | |
|--|--|-------|
| Person(s) Conducting Field Inspection | None Conducted | |
| Site Information | | |
| Location: | DOE 1-M-18 | 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: One (1) unnamed USGS identified intermittent Drainage

If yes, describe location relative to facility: The unnamed intermittent drainage is located 287 feet to the west of the proposed 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. If a potential release were to migrate of the western side flow would be to the west towards the unnamed intermittent drainage.

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

High during periods of intermittent flow Low during periods of no flow

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):

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 is one (1) unnamed USGS identified intermittent drainage located within a ¼ mile of the existing facility. The facility, as it is currently proposed to be expanded, limits the direction of a potential release to the western side. If a potential release were to migrate off the facility on this side, flow would be to the west down a very steep embankment. During facility expansion, Best Management Practices (BMP's) should be installed in the form of an earthen perimeter berm on all fill slope sides. If feasible, a diversion ditch should be constructed along the toe of the fill slope sides to ensure total site containment in the event of a potential release. All 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 are no permitted water wells in the immediate vicinity of the proposed facility. The closest permitted water well is located 5,357 feet to the southeast and would not provide accurate information on the depth to groundwater. Based on aerial photography review, the vegetative cover in the immediate vicinity of the existing facility is fairly sparse due to the steepness of the surrounding terrain. The vegetation that is present appears to be sage and bunch grasses which does not suggest the presence of shallow groundwater. There was no visual evidence of any springs or seeps. In addition, the existing facility is constructed on a very steep hillside where the depth to bedrock (U. Wasatch or L. Green River Formations) is most likely quite shallow. Based on the topographic setting of the proposed facility it could be assumed that the depth to groundwater, if present, would be in excess of 100 feet if not greater.

Based on the information collected during this desktop review, the potential to impact groundwater has been deemed as low. The greatest potential for impacts would be to the unnamed intermittent drainage located to the west of the existing facility. If a potential release were to migrate off the facility on the western side, flow would be to the west down the steep embankment where it would enter the unnamed intermittent drainage. The drainage does exhibit a fairly defined channel with little or no debris/vegetation indicating it does flow intermittently during the year most likely in the early spring and during heavier precipitation events. If a release were to enter the drainage during periods of intermittent flow, impacts could potentially reach the Colorado River as the drainage feature has direct hydraulic connection to the river. However, the severity of potential impacts to the Colorado River is not known but could be fairly low due to the distance to the river and the fact the drainage feature is tributary and flows into a larger intermittent drainage feature prior to entering the Colorado River.

With the high potential for impacts to surface water and potentially the Colorado River during periods of intermittent flow, the existing facility should be designated as being in a sensitive area.



Inspector Signature(s): Mark E. Mumby Date: 5/30/2018

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