

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | CamWest Exploration, LLC Beta Race Federal #14-8 & #22-6 Oil Wells | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Slawson Exploration Co., Inc. 6-1 Oil and Gas Well | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 12-2 Oil & Gas Well | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | YES |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 10-3 Oil and Gas Well | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 2-13 Oil Well | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Equity Oil Co. 33-14 Oil and Gas Well | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | YES |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Belco Energy Corp. Bull Creek Federal 1-13 and 5-23 Oil Wells | NO | Professionally designed and built access roads and pads, signing, fencing, Conditions of Approval (COAs) | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 11-1 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | No | The access roads and well pads were required to be designed to safety standards. During the drilling phase personal protective equipment was required for everyone on location. The drilling plans required Blow Out Preventers (BOP's), and safety equipment as required by State and Federal Agencies. H2S wind socks and warning signs were also required on the locations. | | | | | No |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 13-30 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | No | The access roads and well pads were required to be designed to safety standards. During the drilling phase personal protective equipment was required for everyone on location. The drilling plans required Blow Out Preventers (BOP's), and safety equipment as required by State and Federal Agencies. H2S wind socks and warning signs were also required on the locations. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 2 | Pawnee | Walsh Production, Inc. 12-13 Wildcat Well | NO | Risks were avoided by strict adherence to the Drilling Plan OSHA requirements, and by fencing the drill site (plus well and production facilities if the well produced) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Proposed Development of the West Light Foot Oil and Gas Field by O'Brien Energy Resources Corporation | NO | Risks were avoided by strict adherence to the Drilling Plan OSHA requirements, and by fencing the drill site (plus well and production facilities if the well produced) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Analysis of the Potential Development of the South Lilli Oil Field | NO | Risks were avoided by strict adherence to the Drilling Plan OSHA requirements, and by fencing the drill site (plus well and production facilities if the well produced) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | White River | Willsource Exploratory Project | No | The project avoided effects on public health and safety and in fact improved public health and safety by increasing sight distance clearing, curve widening and surfacing (for travel during wet conditions). | | | | | No |
| 2 | White River | Hightower Mountain Exploratory Project | No | The project avoided effects on public health and safety and in fact improved public health and safety by increasing sight distance clearing, curve widening and surfacing (for travel during wet conditions). | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-3/Injection Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-2/Water Supply Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Central Tank Battery Site & USAX Well Site | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-11-2/Injection Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-6/Oil Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-3/Injection Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-1/Injection Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-1/Water Supply Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-13-1/Injection Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-4/Water Supply Well | No | Followed all of Federal and State Regulations; implemented a closed pit system within the Cimarron River corridor; all drill fluids and cuttings were removed to clay lined pit outside Riv corridor | | | | | No |
| 2 | GMUG | Gunnison Energy Exploratory Gas Drilling Project | No | Migrations measures on traffic and road use, fire prevention and for safe handling of chemical compounds reduced the risk. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Bill Barrett Big Porcupine CBNG Project | no | dust suppression, water discharge firearms, water well agreements, hazardous substances | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Prima Porcupine CBNG Project | no | dust suppression, water discharge firearms, water well agreements, hazardous substances | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | True Oil Kirby Fed. Oil Well #22-31 | no | roads | | | | | no |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Devon Energy Oil Well #21-11 | no | roads | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Ballard Petroleum Oil Well #14-31 | no | Roads, autogates | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Brown Operating Co. Oil Well #1-18 | no | Roads | | | | | no |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #12 | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#44B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#28B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #13 & #13A | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 52#6A | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | Yes |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #58M | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #29B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #149C | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #51M | No | 24 hour surveillance until site brought into production | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #69M | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Valencia Canyon Unit #45B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPPO | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 3 | Carson | Gregory Federal A #1A | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-4 Unit #41B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-5 #29B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #372 | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #4C | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 55 #2A | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #375 | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #188B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SOPA | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson 200, 202, 203, 204S, 207S | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 19B-10 | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 24A-10 | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #26A | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #32N | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #55B | No | Avoided Risks, mitigated through signing and SUPO | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 3 | Cibola | USA 6-31 | No | Mitigation measures incorporated into the EA, surface use plan, COAs, and down-hole BLM regulations. | | | | | No |
| 8 | OzarkSIFr | Weiser Brown Operating Company Proposal | No | Standard Operating Procedures were used by the Company as outlined in approved Application for Permit to Drill and in coordination/cooperation with BLM. (e. lined pit, slopes, etc.) | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | No |
| 8 | Kisatchie | USA 31 No 1 WELL AND ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTE | No | Public activity in the project vicinity was limited to USFS related activity. Only limited vehicle access would be allowed during construction. Road signage and traffic safety precautions were employed. Engineering practices were in accordance with USA Standard Code for Pressure Piping, ANSI B 31.4 'Liquid Petroleum Transportation Piping System' Dept. of Transportation Reg. 49CFR, Part 195; 'Transportation of Hazardous Liquids by Pipeline.' Dept. of Transportation Reg. 49CFR, Part 192 'Transportation of Natural and Other Gas by Pipelines: Minimum Federal Safety Standards.' Fencing was used to delineate the site and avoid public access. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 Anderson 31-5 #1 | No | This well is still active. During implementation of this project, all mitigation measures outlined in the EA, FONSI and Conditions of Approval were followed to protect public health & safety. Monitoring & inspection by the FS verified compliance. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48948 Prospect 19-10 #1 | No | Public Health & Safety is addressed in the EA, FONSI, COA and in an H2S contingency plan. All mitigation was followed implemented during drilling; the well was a dry hole and has since been fully restored. FS documentation of on site inspections fully concurs that no impacts to public health & safety occurred. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 002442 | No | Operator complied with mitigation measures identified in FS Conditions of Approval and Finding of No Significant Impact including applicable Federal and State laws and regulations. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47016 | No | Operator complied with mitigation measures identified in FS Conditions of Approval and Finding of No Significant Impact including applicable Federal and State laws and regulations. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47622 | No | Measures implemented during the course of this project complied with the techniques, methods and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment and FONSI as well as the Forest Service Conditions of Approval including applicable Federal Laws and Regulations. monitoring and Inspection by the Forest Service verified compliance during implementation. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-14 | No | Measures implemented during the course of this project complied with the techniques, methods and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment and FONSI as well as the Forest Service Conditions of Approval including applicable Federal Laws and Regulations. Monitoring and Inspection by the Forest Service verified compliance during implementation. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-6 | No | Measures implemented during the course of this project complied with the techniques, methods and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment and FONSI as well as the Forest Service Conditions of Approval including applicable Federal Laws and Regulations. Monitoring and Inspection by the Forest Service verified compliance during implementation. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 49542 | No | Measures implemented during the course of this project complied with the techniques, methods and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment and FONSI as well as the Forest Service Conditions of Approval including applicable Federal Laws and Regulations. Monitoring and Inspection by the Forest Service verified compliance during implementation. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 50639 | No | Measures implemented during the course of this project complied with the techniques, methods and mitigation measures identified in the Environmental Assessment and FONSI as well as the Forest Service Conditions of Approval including applicable Federal Laws and Regulations. Monitoring and Inspection by the Forest Service verified compliance during implementation. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2) Public Health and Safety. | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | Did the project have effects on public health or safety? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)) | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on public health and safety. | If YES, what aspect of public health or safety was affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on public health or safety, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on public health or safety? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on public health and safety are or are not significant? | Did the project have effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 57403(A) | No | Techniques, measures & mitigation outlined in the EA, FONSI and COA's were adhered to. Monitoring & inspection by the FS verified compliance during drilling. This was a dry hole and the location has been fully restored. There are no impacts to public health or safety | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 White 31-13 #1 | No | During implementation of this project, all mitigation measures for environmental & public health issues addressed in the EA, FONSI and Conditions of Approval were followed successfully. Monitoring & inspection by the FS verified compliance. The access road is gated to general public access, with approach signs on Hwy 63 | | | | | No |
| 9 | Monongahela | Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation Horton Block Natural Gas Well Development and Frank Mountain Pipeline Project Environmental Assessment | No | Drilling inspection reports and monitoring in 2005 indicate provisions included in the Surface Use Plan and BLM On-shore orders that protect public health and safety were implemented as part of drilling MNF 15 and 18. Example provisions included installation and maintenance of a blow out preventer during drilling, erecting standard gates for controlling public access to well sites, and installing a sign on the producing well MNF 15 informing visitors not to camp or discharge firearms on the well site. No Extremely Hazardous Substances (40 CFR 355) and less than 10,000 pounds of chemical listed on EPA's list of chemicals that subject to reporting were used during drilling, cementing and stimulation. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4B Federal Well | No | Chapter 1509 of Ohio Revised Code, 36CFR 228.108-109 and surface use plan of APD were implemented and followed. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4C Federal Well | No | Chapter 1509 of Ohio Revised Code, 36CFR 228.108-109 and surface use plan of APD were implemented and followed. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | CamWest Exploration, LLC Beta Race Federal #14-8 & #22-6 Oil Wells | No unique characteristics present | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Slawson Exploration Co., Inc. 6-1 Oil and Gas Well | No unique characteristics present | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 12-2 Oil & Gas Well | Tracy Mountain IRA, Cultural-see Cultural section | Roadless characteristics | The oil and gas well and access road effected the southeastern portion of the IRA | Existing oil and gas wells located in the southeastern portion of the IRA | The roadless characteristics of this portion of the IRA had already been impacted by exiting wells and access roads. This well was additive to existing effects on roadless characteristics. Future oil and gas development will likely result in loss of roadless character. | YES |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 10-3 Oil and Gas Well | No unique characteristics present | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 2-13 Oil Well | No unique characteristics present | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Equity Oil Co. 33-14 Oil and Gas Well | Bell Lake IRA | Roadless characteristics | This well is located approximately 150 feet off county road #708, which serves as the eastern boundary for the IRA. | In 2004 the Equity 32-4 oil and gas well was drilled in Section 4 of the IRA | The location of the well so close to the county road would have had little if any affect on the IRA's roadless characteristics. Standard mitigations to minimize visual and audio impacts were also implemented. | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Belco Energy Corp. Bull Creek Federal 1-13 and 5-23 Oil Wells | No unique characteristics present | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 11-1 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | The oil and gas well proposal is located within the developed MonDak Oil Field. There are no unique characteristics of the geographic area. The well pad and access road are currently reclamation status. The disturbed area was recontoured to original landscape and seeded with native seed mixture. | | | | | No |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 13-30 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | The oil and gas well proposal is located within the developed MonDak Oil Field. There are no unique characteristics of the geographic area. The well pad and access road are currently reclamation status. The disturbed area was recontoured to original landscape and seeded with native seed mixture. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 2 | Pawnee | Walsh Production, Inc. 12-13 Wildcat Well | There are no unique characteristics in the geographic area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Proposed Development of the West Light Foot Oil and Gas Field by O'Brien Energy Resources Corporation | There are no unique characteristics in the geographic area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Analysis of the Potential Development of the South Lilli Oil Field | There are no unique characteristics in the geographic area | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | White River | Willsource Exploratory Project | The project avoided new road construction and did not impact any unique characteristics (as defined by 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) (3)) within the project area where the new well pad was constructed. | | | | | No |
| 2 | White River | Hightower Mountain Exploratory Project | Except where road widening and minor (i.e., less than 10 extra feet of cut) additional pad expansion was needed for safety, the project avoided new ground disturbance. Additionally, where new ground disturbance was needed, there were no impacts to unique characteristics (as defined by 40 CFR 1508.27 (b) (3)). | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-3/Injection Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-2/Water Supply Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Central Tank Battery Site & USAX Well Site | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-11-2/Injection Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-6/Oil Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-3/Injection Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-1/Injection Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-1/Water Supply Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-13-1/Injection Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-4/Water Supply Well | Facilities were painted earth tone colors to minimize visual impacts; installation of central tank battery reduced number of facilities on individual well pads | | | | | No |
| 2 | GMUG | Gunnison Energy Exploratory Gas Drilling Project | No prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, ecologically critical areas or other unique characteristics exist in the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Bill Barrett Big Porcupine CBNG Project | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Prima Porcupine CBNG Project | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | True Oil Kirby Fed. Oil Well #22-31 | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Devon Energy Oil Well #21-11 | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Ballard Petroleum Oil Well #14-31 | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Brown Operating Co. Oil Well #1-18 | no unique characteristics | | | | | no |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #12 | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#44B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#28B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #13 & #13A | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 52#6A | | Located within 1/4 mile corridor for potentially eligible Wild & Scenic River | Listed outstanding remarkable values for the segment were impacted (riparian and cultural resources). | Virtually the entire segment is currently leased for gas development. River is intermittent and thus lacks a strong linkage of ORV to river. | May effect the possibility to designate the segment. The area was leased and the EA was signed prior to the inventory of this river as eligible. | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #58M | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #29B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #149C | No unique characteristics (Supervisor Office email 9/20/2005) | | | | | NO |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #51M | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #69M | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Valencia Canyon Unit #45B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 3 | Carson | Gregory Federal A #1A | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-4 Unit #41B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-5 #29B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #372 | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #4C | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 55 #2A | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #375 | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #188B | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson 200, 202, 203, 204S, 207S | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 19B-10 | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 24A-10 | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #26A | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #32N | No unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #55B | No unique characteristics | | | | | Yes |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 3 | Cibola | USA 6-31 | No unique characteristics of the geographic area were identified either in the original EA or the site monitoring. | | | | | No |
| 8 | OzarkSIFr | Weiser Brown Operating Company Proposal | There were no unique characteristics found within the project area. | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | No |
| 8 | Kisatchie | USA 31 No 1 WELL AND ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTE | No wetlands or streams were impacted. The pipeline was bored under the road and stream crossing just south of the well pad to avoid any disturbance to the riparian zone and stream channel. Containment structures (dikes and pits) were employed to avoid offsite movement of any materials. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 Anderson 31-5 #1 | Project design avoided areas of potential impacts; Forest plan restricts leasing in most areas of unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48948 Prospect 19-10 #1 | Project design avoided areas of potential impacts; Forest plan restricts leasing in most areas of unique characteristics | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 002442 | The geographic area is composed of gently rolling pinelands and small hardwood drainage areas. A heavily used state highway located nearby. The project area required very little earthmoving and leveling activities to facilitate project implementation. No drains or associated wetlands were disturbed or altered during project activities. Flowlines were bored under drains to avoid potential effects. The Forest Service set specific requirements for surface protection, restoration, and revegetation. These required measures are in the process of being implemented to even slopes and maintain the general landform of the project's geographic area. Currently, the site is stable with no erosion problems. Some herbaceous vegetation has been planted. Complete restoration of the site is planning for the near future. Monitoring will continue. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47016 | The project area required very little earth moving and leveling activities to facilitate project implementation. The geographic area is composed of gently rolling pinelands and small hardwood drainage areas. No drains were affected or altered during project implementation and forest service requirements for reclamation/restoration were followed in accordance with the E to maintain the original landform and mitigate any potential erosion. Currently, the site is stable with no erosion problems and plentiful herbaceous and woody cover across the project area. The requirements for reclamation/restoration were completed, and the geographic area/ landscape encompassing the project area was not disturbed or altered by this project. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47622 | The project area showed very little erosion and the few areas had been well checked and under control. No adverse effects the geographical area were noted nor expected. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-14 | This is a flat ridgetop area with minimal impact. Small amount erosion in the southwest area noted, but new plant/tree growth has checked any major expansion. Four small pools of standir water less than two meter were noted but are unlikely to expand as they are in the flat area probably tire tracks. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-6 | This old ridg top was removed in a very efficient manner. Small amount of erosion noted on west side of site and along the nor side. No major erosion, but should be watched. This is an excellent example of good planning. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 49542 | The project area required very little leveling/earth moving activities to facilitate the project's implementation. Drainage areas to the North & South did not display any excessive erosion during the inspection. Reclamation/restoration were followed in accordance with the E.A. to mitigate any potential erosion. Currently the site is stable with no noted erosion problems. No drains were affected or altered during the project implementation. no significant adverse impact noted per section 1508.27. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 50639 | Note: Currently in the interim Guidelines - Sandy Creek Area for Roadless. According to the guidelines at the time of the implementation the area of concern did not have an effect on the unique characteristics of the geographic area. Interim Guidelines now place this area in a "Roadless" category. Restoration was conducted in multiple events/stages to meet the current regulations. Currently marked erosion exists in the far east area of the well site. Smaller areas appeared to be healing via natural nature restoration. Plans to check the far east erosion area are currently under consideration. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) Unique Characteristics of the Geographic Area | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on unique characteristics of the geographic area. | If YES, what unique characteristics were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on unique characteristics, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on unique characteristics? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on unique characteristics are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on cultural or historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 57403(A) | Project design avoided areas of potential impacts; Forest plan restricts leasing in most areas of unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 White 31-13 #1 | Project design avoided areas of potential impacts; Forest plan restricts leasing in most areas of unique characteristics | | | | | No |
| 9 | Monongahela | Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation Horton Block Natural Gas Well Development and Frank Mountain Pipeline Project Environmental Assessment | Field monitoring confirmed project implementation did not affect unique characteristics or areas as none exist within areas affected by MNF 15 and 18. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4B Federal Well | Unique characteristics do not exist in the immediate vicinity of the well site | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4C Federal Well | Avoided scenic Little Muskingum by requiring a 100 foot wooded buffer zone. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | CamWest Exploration, LLC Beta Race Federal #14-8 & #22-6 Oil Wells | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Slawson Exploration Co., Inc. 6-1 Oil and Gas Well | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 12-2 Oil & Gas Well | | Little Missouri Badlands Military Complex | The Davis Creek corridor is a relatively pristine area containing important circa 19th Century historical sites of the Great Northern Sioux War, including the Custer Trail. Cumulative effects on the scenic view shed, of continued development of minerals production facilities, have dictated the need for screening to preserve the historical ambiance and historic context of this area. Bounded area is small because topograph screening was used to mitigate visual impact. The temporal effect is defined by the life of the oil well which ranges on average between 5 and 25 years. Oil well and access road are obliterated once production is complete. | Existing oil and gas access roads and well pads. Also existing transportation network | Archelological survey and clearance, creation of Davis Creek Corridor analysis to guide future development in Davis creek drainage. | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 10-3 Oil and Gas Well | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 2-13 Oil Well | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Equity Oil Co. 33-14 Oil and Gas Well | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Belco Energy Corp. Bull Creek Federal 1-13 and 5-23 Oil Wells | Archelological survey revealed no impacts from project | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 11-1 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | A cultural resource survey was completed by a contracted qualified archeologist and cleared by the District Archeologist. The surveyed area covered a 10 acre plot around the center of the well bore and 15 foot corridor for the access road. The cultural resource survey was cleared by the State Historic Preservation Officer. | | | | | No |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 13-30 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | A cultural resource survey was completed by a contracted qualified archeologist and cleared by the District Archeologist. The surveyed area covered a 10 acre plot around the center of the well bore and 15 foot corridor for the access road. The cultural resource survey was cleared by the State Historic Preservation Officer. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 2 | Pawnee | Walsh Production, Inc. 12-13 Wildcat Well | Arch survey completed to comply with Section 106 found no cultural or historic resources. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Proposed Development of the West Light Foot Oil and Gas Field by O'Brien Energy Resources Corporation | Arch survey completed to comply with Section 106 found a site eligible for inclusion on the national register. The FS worked with the company, BLM and Tribal leaders and agreed to re-locate the proposed well so it would not affect the site. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Analysis of the Potential Development of the South Lilli Oil Field | Arch surveys are completed to comply with Section 106 when APDs are submitted. Mitigation for any cultural sites found during these surveys is re-siting the well to avoid impacting the identified site. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | White River | Willsource Exploratory Project | Implementation of the project avoided effects on cultural resources by design as outlined in the EA and carried forward as a condition of approval. | | | | | No |
| 2 | White River | Hightower Mountain Exploratory Project | There were no cultural or historic resources documented in surveys. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-3/Injection Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-2/Water Supply Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Central Tank Battery Site & USAX Well Site | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-11-2/Injection Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-6/Oil Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-3/Injection Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-1/Injection Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-1/Water Supply Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-13-1/Injection Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-4/Water Supply Well | Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no cultural sites were identified on the surface; sub-surface monitoring was conducted during the construction phase | | | | | No |
| 2 | GMUG | Gunnison Energy Exploratory Gas Drilling Project | No cultural resources were found during surveys. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Bill Barrett Big Porcupine CBNG Project | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Prima Porcupine CBNG Project | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | True Oil Kirby Fed. Oil Well #22-31 | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Devon Energy Oil Well #21-11 | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Ballard Petroleum Oil Well #14-31 | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Brown Operating Co. Oil Well #1-18 | wells and utility lines were located to avoid sites | | | | | no |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #12 | No eligible properties present. Two isolated finds were recorded. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#44B | No eligible properties present. Three isolated finds and one ineligible site were recorded. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#28B | No eligible properties present. One isolated find was recorded. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #13 & #13A | No eligible properties present. Three isolated finds were recorded. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 52#6A | Nearby eligible site was supposed to be fenced and monitored. The site was avoided, but disturbance occurred immediately adjacent to the site within the area that was marked for avoidance. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #58M | One eligible site in road and two isolated finds were recorded.; no adverse effects to date | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #29B | Three archeological sites and four isolated finds were found. The project was determined to have no adverse effects on the sites. One site had been previously disturbed by road construction. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #149C | No eligible properties; one ineligible property has been recorded. It was adjacent to the project. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #51M | Three archeological sites were found. The project was determined to have no adverse effects on the sites. One site had been previously disturbed by road construction. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #69M | Four archeological sites and nine isolated finds were found within the project vicinity. Sites were apparently avoided but the monitoring report is not yet available. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Valencia Canyon Unit #45B | No sites present | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 3 | Carson | Gregory Federal A #1A | One archeological site and one isolated find were found and site was apparently avoided the monitoring report is not available. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-4 Unit #41B | No sites present | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-5 #29B | No sites present | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #372 | Two archeological sites and six isolated finds were present. An error marking could have resulted in significant impact to an eligible site, but the error was corrected and the sites were avoided. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #4C | One eligible site near the project area was avoided. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 55 #2A | One eligible site was recorded. A monitor was required on site during pad construction. The site was avoided, but disturbance occurred immediately adjacent to the site within the area that was marked for avoidance | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #375 | No sites present | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #188B | No sites present | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson 200, 202, 203, 204S, 207S | Several sites in vicinity but no adverse effects. Several sites had previously been disturbed by road construction. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 19B-10 | No eligible properties present. One isolated find was recorded. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 24A-10 | No sites present. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #26A | Two archeological sites and seven isolated finds were found within the project vicinity. One of the sites had been previously damaged by road construction. Both sites were avoided. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #32N | Four archeological sites and five isolated finds were found within the project vicinity. The sites were avoided. One of the sites had been previously damaged by pipeline construction. | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #55B | | One eligible site was disturbed by tree felling. | Trees fell within the site boundaries during clearing activities. | None | Disturbance was local and small in size and did not adversely affect the site. | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 3 | Cibola | USA 6-31 | The project site was inventoried and input was requested from Tribal Organizations concerning sites of traditional cultural or religious significance within the project area. No sites have been identified. | | | | | No |
| 8 | OzarkSIFr | Weiser Brown Operating Company Proposal | Cultural Resource surveys were completed & SHPO concurrence received prior to Decision Notice being signed. No significant sites located within project area. | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | No |
| 8 | Kisatchie | USA 31 No 1 WELL AND ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTE | An archeological field survey was conducted at the proposed well site, access road and alternative pipeline routes. No sites were located during the assessment. SHPO concurred with the findings | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 Anderson 31-5 #1 | The area was surveyed for cultural resources. According to the MOU Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO, No cultural resources were found, and a No Heritage Resource form was completed. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48948 Prospect 19-10 #1 | The area was surveyed for cultural resources. According to the MOU Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO, No cultural resources were found, and a No Heritage Resource form was completed. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 002442 | Area was surveyed prior to disturbance and there are no known archaeological or standing structures present or other properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47016 | Area was surveyed for heritage resources. Based upon this survey, a "No Heritage Resources" report was completed. No heritage resources were identified. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47622 | Based on the Survey History of this area it is very unlikely that any cultural resources would be found. The outer limits of the well siter were inspected for cultural resources with none being noted. Ground surface visibility (GSV) ranged from 20-60% in the inspected area with no cultural historic material noted. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-14 | This area was previously surveyed for cultural resources and based on the survey 10 cultural/historical/heritage resources were noted. During the subsequent building of the well site no cultural resources were encountered/reported. Current inspection of the well site indicated no significant resources are currently exposed/impacted. No cultural resources found. Large 1-3 meter area with 80+ O/C GSV allowed for a good inspection. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-6 | 12+ years of area surveys have shown this type of area is highly unlikely for cultural/historic resources. A survey prior to the start of this project did not indicate any archaeological sites present at that time and inspection today was also negative. Several areas with ground surface visibility (GSV) of 60-80% where inspected for surface cultural material and only historic material noted (iron, glass, plastic, modern glass). Area is still noted as negative for cultural resources. A cultural survey conducted 6/27/05 & 6/28/05 in an area similar & the near vicinity was also negative for cultural resources. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 49542 | Prior to any development, a cultural resource survey was conducted and the area was negative for cultural material. Previous survey results historically over the past 12 years have generally been negative for cultural resources. At the time of this inspection, areas of 0.5 to 1 meter in size were near 100% ground surface visibility (GSV) allowing inspection for cultural materials which were negative for cultural material other than shotgun shell wads & clay pigeon material confirm previous results survey. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 50639 | Historically this area is essentially void of significant cultural resources based on our 12 years of intensive survey. Previous archaeology have coined this area a "no man's land" due to the lack of cultural resources being found. During the inspection the main area was walked over and did indicate an ample supply of raw | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8) Cultural or Historic Resources | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on cultural or historic resources. | If YES, what cultural or historic resources were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on cultural or historic resources, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on cultural or historic resources? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on cultural or historic resources are or are not significant? | Did the project have any effects on threatened and endangered species or its identified "critical" habitat under ESA? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 57403(A) | The area was surveyed for cultural resources. According to the MOU Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO, No cultural resources were found, and a No Heritage Resource form was completed. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 White 31-13 #1 | The area was surveyed for cultural resources. According to the MOU Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service and the Mississippi SHPO, No cultural resources were found, and a No Heritage Resource form was completed. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Monongahela | Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation Horton Block Natural Gas Well Development and Frank Mountain Pipeline Project Environmental Assessment | The area of potential effect for cultural resources was surveyed prior project implementation, and no cultural resources were found. The well sites were constructed within the surveyed area. Therefore, as predicted in the EA, drilling MNF 15 and 18 had no effect to cultural resources. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4B Federal Well | Cultural survey by forest Archeologist indicated no cultural or historic resources. | | | | | NO |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4C Federal Well | Project avoided rock quarry that may have historic significance | | | | | NO |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | CamWest Exploration, LLC Beta Race Federal #14-8 & #22-6 Oil Wells | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Slawson Exploration Co., Inc. 6-1 Oil and Gas Well | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 12-2 Oil & Gas Well | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 10-3 Oil and Gas Well | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 2-13 Oil Well | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Equity Oil Co. 33-14 Oil and Gas Well | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Belco Energy Corp. Bull Creek Federal 1-13 and 5-23 Oil Wells | No T&E on Dakota Praire Grasslands | | | | | NO |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 11-1 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | A Biological Evaluation (BE) was completed for this proposal. The District Wildlife Biologist concurred with the BE, which determined the following: There are "No Effects" to Threatened (T) or Endangered (E) species as there are no T&E species currently residing or breeding in the area or on the Little Missouri National Grassland. | | | | | No |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 13-30 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | A Biological Evaluation (BE) was completed for this proposal. The District Wildlife Biologist concurred with the BE, which determined the following: There are "No Effects" to Threatened (T) or Endangered (E) species as there are no T&E species currently residing or breeding in the area or on the Little Missouri National Grassland. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 2 | Pawnee | Walsh Production, Inc. 12-13 Wildcat Well | The Bald Eagle is threatened and has been found on the PNG. The Biological Evaluation for the project documented that the species does not occur in the area and would not be affected by the project. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Proposed Development of the West Light Foot Oil and Gas Field by O'Brien Energy Resources Corporation | The Bald Eagle is threatened and has been found on the PNG. The Biological Evaluation for the project documented that the species does not occur in the area and would not be affected by the project. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | Pawnee | Analysis of the Potential Development of the South Lilli Oil Field | The Bald Eagle is threatened and has been found on the PNG. The Biological Evaluation for the project documented that the species does not occur in the area and would not be affected by the project. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No |
| 2 | White River | Willsorce Exploratory Project | There was either no suitable habitat or the project was designed to avoid impacts to the analyzed T & E species (see BA) and their habitat. However the project BA did have a default determination (for any size water depletion of "may affect, and is likely to adversely affect" Colorado River "Big River Fish" (see BA). | | | | | No |
| 2 | White River | Hightower Mountain Exploratory Project | There was either no suitable habitat or the project was designed to avoid impacts to the analyzed T & E species (see BA) and their habitat. However the project BA did have a default determination (for any size water depletion of "may affect, and is likely to adversely affect" Colorado River "Big River Fish" (see BA). | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-3/Injection Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-2/Water Supply Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Central Tank Battery Site & USAX Well Site | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-11-2/Injection Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-6/Oil Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-3/Injection Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-1/Injection Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-1/Water Supply Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-13-1/Injection Well | Timing restrictions were placed on project area to avoid affecting threatened species. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-4/Water Supply Well | There are no threatened or endangered species or critical habitat within the project area. | | | | | No |
| 2 | GMUG | Gunnison Energy Exploratory Gas Drilling Project | No T and E species or their habitats were affected by the authorization. | | | | | No |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Bill Barrett Big Porcupine CBNG Project | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Prima Porcupine CBNG Project | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | True Oil Kirby Fed. Oil Well #22-31 | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Devon Energy Oil Well #21-11 | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Ballard Petroleum Oil Well #14-31 | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Brown Operating Co. Oil Well #1-18 | habitat and nest locations were avoided or mitigated, timing limitations | | | | | no |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #12 | Habitat did not contain constituent elements thus "may effect, not likely to adversely effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#44B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#28B | Habitat did not contain constituent elements thus "may effect, not likely to adversely effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #13 & #13A | Habitat did not contain constituent elements thus "may effect, not likely to adversely effect" determination | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 52#6A | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | Yes |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #58M | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #29B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #149C | Habitat did not contain constituent elements thus "may effect, not likely to adversely effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #51M | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #69M | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Valencia Canyon Unit #45B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 3 | Carson | Gregory Federal A #1A | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-4 Unit #41B | Habitat did not contain constituent elements thus "may effect, not likely to adversely effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-5 #29B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #372 | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | Yes |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #4C | No habitat or species present; adjacent to MSO critical habitat. Support determination of "may effect, not likely to adverse effect". | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 55 #2A | No habitat or species present; adjacent to MSO critical habitat. Support determination of "may effect, not likely to adverse effect". | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #375 | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #188B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carson 200, 202, 203, 204S, 207S | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 19B-10 | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 24A-10 | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #26A | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #32N | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #55B | No habitat or species present thus "no effect" determination | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 3 | Cibola | USA 6-31 | Biological Assesment and current T&E review determined no effect due no suitable habitat. | | | | | No |
| 8 | OzarkSIFr | Weiser Brown Operating Company Proposal | A Biological Evaluation was completed prior to Decision Notice being signed. There was "no effect" to PETS noted in the BE. | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | no |
| 8 | Kisatchie | USA 31 No 1 WELL AND ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTE | A field survey was conducted at the proposed well site and pipeline route. There are no treated or endangered species known in the area and none were found as a result of the survey. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 Anderson 31-5 #1 | No TES or "critical" habitat located in the project area. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48948 Prospect 19-10 #1 | No TES or "critical" habitat located in the project area. | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/ critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 002442 | Site-specific wildlife & plant surveys were conducted prior to construction. No sensitive or T & E species were found. Directional boring occurred under Cypress Creek for pipeline installation to avoid effects to potential sensitive fish (crystal darter & freckled darter). | | | | | Yes |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47016 | Site-specific wildlife & plant surveys were conducted prior to construction. Gopher tortoise burrows were located off site. They were the only sensitive or T & E species found. Gopher tortoise burrows located off site were protected from logging & site clearing activities. Barrier was installed around drilling pad during drilling activities to prevent gopher tortoises from entering work area. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47622 | outside of 3/4 mile RCW buffer zone; did not cut suitable den trees or construct road | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-14 | There was a "may effect, likely to adversely affect determination" for RCW formal consultation ensued. Biological opinion issued 3 takes, with required mitigation (reasonable and prudent measures). Mitigation included: all oil well drilling operations & construction for drilling will be performed after nesting & fledging. Red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) colony will be monitored before & after drilling operation, oil well operator will install 5 artificial RCW cavities if RCW decide to relocate. Terms & conditions: during drilling, light used during night time will not be pointed in direction of RCW cavity, if necessary, fabric will be used to shield active cavities from direct light, smaller trees on periphery of the oil well site will be left to also buffer the cavities from light & noise. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-6 | Foraging criteria met; no den trees cut, not system road (gated & low traffic) | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 49542 | outside of RCW habitat; no Louisiana Black Bears known from this area; road constructed has 1 on use and gated. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 50639 | no RCW habitat; no den trees cut or system roads (gated and low traffic) built so no impact to Louisiana Black Bears | | | | | No |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9) Threatened and Endangered Species or "Critical" Habitat | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If NO, explain how project implementation avoided effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitat. | If YES, what threatened and endangered species/critical habitats were affected? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's effect on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these cumulative effects on threatened and endangered species/critical habitats are or are not significant? | Did the project threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement for the protection of the environment? (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)) |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 57403(A) | No TES or "critical" habitat located in the project area. | | | | | No |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 White 31-13 #1 | No TES or "critical" habitat located in the project area. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Monongahela | Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation Horton Block Natural Gas Well Development and Frank Mountain Pipeline Project Environmental Assessment | Project monitoring confirmed that effects were consistent with those analyzed in the EA, including implementation may affect, but not likely to adversely affect any T & E species, nor would the project create a trend to federal listing. | | | | | No |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4B Federal Well | Well site & road mostly in pine stand and open area. No suitable habitat for T&E species. | | | | | NO |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4C Federal Well | Timber was removed between September 15 and April 15. Well site was 125 feet from Little Muskingum River | | | | | NO |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | CamWest Exploration, LLC Beta Race Federal #14-8 & #22-6 Oil Wells | | | | | Maah Daah Hey Trail |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Slawson Exploration Co., Inc. 6-1 Oil and Gas Well | | | | | Black-tailed prairie dog town |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 12-2 Oil & Gas Well | | | | | Archeology |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 10-3 Oil and Gas Well | | | | | Sharp-tailed Grouse |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Upton Resources USA, Inc. Federal 2-13 Oil Well | | | | | Bighorn Sheep & habitat |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Equity Oil Co. 33-14 Oil and Gas Well | | | | | Bell Lake IRA |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Belco Energy Corp. Bull Creek Federal 1-13 and 5-23 Oil Wells | | | | | Black-tailed prairie dog & burrowing owls |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 11-1 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | | | | | None |
| 1 | Dakota Prairie | Nance Petroleum Corporation Federal 13-30 Oil and Gas Well Surface Use Plan of Operations | | | | | None |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 2 | Pawnee | Walsh Production, Inc. 12-13 Wildcat Well | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | WL - Mountain Plover, Raptor Nest Sites |
| 2 | Pawnee | Proposed Development of the West Light Foot Oil and Gas Field by O'Brien Energy Resources Corporation | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | WL - Mountain Plover, Raptor Nest Sites |
| 2 | Pawnee | Analysis of the Potential Development of the South Lilli Oil Field | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | WL - Mountain Plover, Raptor Nest Sites |
| 2 | White River | Willsource Exploratory Project | | | | | Elk Calving; erosion and water quality; transportation system changes; threatened, endangered, and sensitive species; and cultural resources |
| 2 | White River | Hightower Mountain Exploratory Project | | | | | TES species - including: Canada lynx, green-tailed towhee, Brewer's sparrow, raptor species, Colorado River Endangered fish species; water resources; recreation activities; erosion and sedimentation; weed invasion; road construction impacts |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-3/Injection Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts, visual impacts and impacts to lesser prairie chickens. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-5-2/Water Supply Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts, visual impacts and impacts to lesser prairie chickens. |
| 2 | Cim | Central Tank Battery Site & USAX Well Site | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts, visual impacts and impacts to lesser prairie chickens. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-11-2/Injection Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts, visual impacts and impacts to lesser prairie chickens. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-6/Oil Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-3/Injection Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-9-1/Injection Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-1/Water Supply Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-13-1/Injection Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |
| 2 | Cim | Stirrup Field SERU-14-4/Water Supply Well | | | | | Significant issues identified were soil loss, water quality, grazing impacts and visual impacts. |
| 2 | GMUG | Gunnison Energy Exploratory Gas Drilling Project | | | | | Air Quality, Soils, Geology/Minerals, Water Resources, Vegetation, Land Use and Recreation, Wildlife and Fisheries, Noise, Visual Resources, Socioeconomics |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Bill Barrett Big Porcupine CBNG Project | | | | | yes |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Prima Porcupine CBNG Project | | | | | yes |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | True Oil Kirby Fed. Oil Well #22-31 | | | | | yes |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Devon Energy Oil Well #21-11 | | | | | yes |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Ballard Petroleum Oil Well #14-31 | | | | | yes |
| 2 | Thunder Basin | Brown Operating Co. Oil Well #1-18 | | | | | yes |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #12 | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#44B | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan #30-4#28B | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #13 & #13A | | | | | No significant issues identified |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|--------|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 52#6A | The Migratory Treaty Bird Act , The Clean Water Act and The National Historic Preservation Act | MTBA-riparian habitat was lost and the well pad encroached on the Arroyo.CWA well pad encroached on the arroyo.NHPA no documentation site being fenced or monitored. Activity occurred outside of bounds identified on site map for protection. | Previous impact from oil and gas development and grazing | Eligible site was still intact although erosion had occurred; most likely from previous activities. | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #58M | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #29B | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #149C | | | | | No significant issues identified |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #51M | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #69M | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Valencia Canyon Unit #45B | | | | | None |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 3 | Carson | Gregory Federal A #1A | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-4 Unit #41B | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 30-5 #29B | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #372 | Clean Water Act and State Clean Water Act | During fracking surface waters from well made it to arroyo | None | Impact was minor and arroyo was dry during operating period | Noise from compressor affects primary winter range |
| 3 | Carson | Carson #4C | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Schalk 55 #2A | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #375 | | | | | Noise from compressor affects primary winter range |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 3 | Carson | Rosa Unit #188B | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Carson 200, 202, 203, 204S, 207S | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 19B-10 | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | Carracas 24A-10 | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #26A | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 28-4 Unit #32N | | | | | None |
| 3 | Carson | San Juan 27-4 Unit #55B | | | | | None |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 3 | Cibola | USA 6-31 | | | | | None |
| 8 | OzarkSIFr | Weiser Brown Operating Company Proposal | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | No significant issues were identified within the EA. |
| 8 | Kisatchie | USA 31 No 1 WELL AND ALTERNATIVE PIPELINE ROUTE | | | | | 1) Protect TESC species and their habitat. 2) Watershed protection and water quality at Drake's and Whiskey Chitto Creeks. 3) Heritage Resources 4) Public Safety 5) Local economy 6) Minimize NF lands used for well sites and pipeline |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 Anderson 31-5 #1 | | | | | 1. Soil Productivity; 2. Water Quality; 3. Air Quality; 4. Forest Vegetation; 5. Wildlife; 6. Recreation & Visual Resources; 7. Health & Safety; 8. Civil Rights |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48948 Prospect 19-10 #1 | | | | | 1. Soil Productivity; 2. Water Quality; 3. Air Quality; 4. Forest Vegetation; 5. Wildlife Species; 6. Recreation & Visual Resources; 7. Heritage Resources; 8. Economics; 9. Health & Safety; 10. Civil Rights |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 002442 | Clean Water Act | Reserve pit fluids contaminated with salt were lost thru a "sinkhold" that developed in the reserve pit. Concern was that salt-water may travel into surface water. Surface water monitoring was implemented downstream to check for chlorides and vegetation in area has been monitored aerially. | None | Additional monitoring of potentially affected streams was implemented immediately after introduction of the threat and continued for approximately 1 month. No evidence of impacts to water quality was ever found. Aerial observation of trees/vegetation in area has not revealed any that are dead or stressed. | 1. Soil & water quality 2. Wetlands, floodplains, riparian areas 3. Vegetation resources 4. Wildlife Resources - MIS 5. Economics |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47016 | | | | | 1. Impacts on soil and water resources resulting from spills and leakage of both saltwater and petroleum products, and from clearing and road use. 2. Spread/ invasion of exotic species (external). |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 47622 | | | | | 1. Potential soil and water impacts resulting from spills and leakage, that may adversely affect site productivity or the quality of the aquatic environment. This concern relates both to salt water and its disposal and petroleum products (internal). 2. Impacts on soil and water quality resulting from the clearing and road use, and its effects on local streams (internal). 3. Cumulative effects of the project and other drilling activity, combined with other projects on the National Forest and surrounding private lands (internal). 4. Fragmentation of habitats on the forest resulting from the development of the well and access road as it effects viable populations of wildlife (internal and external). 5. The effects on the Red-cockaded Woodpecker (internal and external). 6. Cost effectiveness and potential costs to public (internal). 7. Effective spill containment and cleanup (internal). 8. The level of 25% returns to the counties (internal). 9. Restoration work done immediately after the oil well is drilled (internal). 10. Impacts on riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands (r |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-14 | | | | | 1. Potential soil and water impacts resulting from spills and leakage, that may adversely affect site productivity or the quality of the aquatic environment. This concern relates both to salt water and its disposal and petroleum products (internal). 2. Impacts on soil and water quality resulting from the clearing and road use, and its effects on local streams (internal). 3. Cumulative effects of the project and other drilling activity, combined with other projects on the National Forest and surrounding private lands (internal). 4. Fragmentation of habitats on the forest resulting from the development of the well and access road as it effects viable populations of wildlife (internal and external). 5. Cost effectiveness and potential costs to public (internal). 6. Effective spill containment and cleanup (internal). 7. The level of 25% returns to the counties (internal). 8. Restoration work done immediately after the oil well is drilled (internal). 9. Impacts on riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands (internal). 10. Drilling and production of oil on National Forest lands adds to the availability of low cost energy (ge |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 48198 Well USA 25-6 | | | | | 1. Potential soil and water impacts resulting from spills and leakage, that may adversely affect site productivity or the quality of the aquatic environment. This concern relates both to salt water and its disposal and petroleum products (internal). 2. Impacts on soil and water quality resulting from the clearing and road use, and its effects on local streams (internal). 3. Cumulative effects of the project and other drilling activity, combined with other projects on the National Forest and surrounding private lands (internal). 4. Fragmentation of habitats on the forest resulting from the development of the well and access road as it effects viable populations of wildlife (internal and external). 5. Cost effectiveness and potential costs to public (internal). 6. Effective spill containment and cleanup (internal). 7. The level of 25% returns to the counties (internal). 8. Restoration work done immediately after the oil well is drilled (internal). 9. Impacts on riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands (internal). 10. Drilling and production of oil on National Forest land adds to the availability of low cost energy (ge |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 49542 | | | | | 1. Potential soil and water impacts resulting from spills and leakage, that may adversely affect site productivity or the quality of the aquatic environment. This concern relates both to salt water and its disposal and petroleum products (internal). 2. Impacts on soil and water quality resulting from the clearing and road use, and its effects on local streams (internal). 3. Cumulative effects of the project and other drilling activity, combined with other projects on the National Forest and surrounding private lands (internal). 4. Fragmentation of habitats on the forest resulting from the development of the well and access road as it effects viable populations of wildlife (internal and external). 5. Cost effectiveness and potential costs to public (internal). 6. Effective spill containment and cleanup (internal). 7. The level of 25% returns to the counties (internal). 8. Restoration work done immediately after the oil well is drilled (internal). 9. Impacts on riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands (internal). 10. Drilling and production of oil on National Forest land adds to the availability of low cost energy (ge |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 50639 | | | | | 1. Potential soil and water impacts resulting from spills and leakage, that may adversely affect site productivity or the quality of the aquatic environment. This concern relates both to salt water and its disposal and petroleum products (internal). 2. Impacts on soil and water quality resulting from the clearing and road use, and its effects on local streams (internal). 3. Cumulative effects of the projects and other drilling activity, combined with other projects on the National Forest and surrounding private lands (internal). 4. Fragmentation of habitats on the forest resulting from the development of the well and access road as it effects viable populations of wildlife (internal). 5. The effects on the RCS (internal). 6. Cost effectiveness and potential costs to the public (internal). 7. Effective spill containment and cleanup (internal). 8. The level of 25% returns to the counties (internal). 9. Restoration work done immediately after the oil well is drilled (internal). 10. Impacts on riparian areas, floodplains, and wetlands (internal). 11. Drilling and production of oil on National Forest land adds to the availability of low |

| Project Link to Other Worksheets | | | 40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10) Federal, State, or Local Law or Requirements | | | | Monitoring of |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Region | Unit | Project Name | If YES, what laws may have been threatened? | If YES, describe the bounds of this effect on laws or requirements for the protection of the environment, both geographically and in time. | If YES, what other actions added to this project's threat to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment? | If YES, what is your reason for determining that these threats to laws or requirements for the protection of the environment are or are not significant? | Identified Significant Issue(s) from Environmental Assessment |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 57403(A) | | | | | 1. Soil Productivity; 2. Water Quality; 3. Air Quality; 4. Forest Vegetation; 5. Wildlife Species; 6. Recreation & Visual Resources; 7. Heritage Resources; 8. Economics; 9. Health & Safety; 10. Civil Rights |
| 8 | Miss | MSES 41278 White 31-13 #1 | | | | | 1. Soil Productivity; 2. Water Quality; 3. Air Quality; 4. Forest Vegetation; 5. Effect on Wildlife; 6. Recreation & Visual Resources; 7. Heritage Resources; 8. Health & Safety; 9. Civil Rights |
| 9 | Monongahela | Cabot Oil and Gas Corporation Horton Block Natural Gas Well Development and Frank Mountain Pipeline Project Environmental Assessment | | | | | Aquatic Resources/Water Quality/Biodiversity/Recreation Values/Wildlife |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4B Federal Well | | | | | Ground Water |
| 9 | Wayne | Drake 4C Federal Well | | | | | Visual Quality |