# Sensitive Area Determination Checklist

| Williams Production RMT Company | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Person(s) Conducting Field Inspection** | Ashlee Lane | 01/11/11 |
| | Site not accessible due to snow pack; desktop review completed. | |
| **Site Information** | | |
| Location: | NR 23-3 | Time: N/A |
| Type of Facility: | Proposed Well Pad | |
| **Environmental Conditions** | Ground not visible due to snow pack. | |
| | | |
| Temperature (°F) | N/A | |

Has the proposed, new or existing location been designated as a sensitive area?
☐ Yes ☒ No

## SURFACE WATER

1. Are there any surface water features or SWSAs adjacent to or within ¼ mile of the proposed/new or existing facility?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

   If yes, describe location relative to facility:

2. Could a potential release from the facility reach surface water features?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No

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

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

## GROUNDWATER

1. Will the proposed/new or existing facility have any pits which will contain hydrocarbons and chlorides or other E&P wastes?
   ☒ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, List the pit type(s): Drilling pit.

2. Is the site of the proposed facility underlain by an unconfined aquifer or recharge zone?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No

3. Is the hydraulic conductivity of the underlying soil or geologic material $\leq 1.0 \times 10^{-7}$ cm/sec?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Is the proposed facility located within 1/8 mile of a domestic water well or 1/4 mile of a public water supply well which would use the same aquifer?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Is the proposed facility located within a 100 year floodplain?
   ☐ Yes (*Sensitive Area*) ☒ No (*If no, proceed to question #6.*)

6. Is the depth to groundwater known?
   ☐ Yes (*If yes, follow instructions provided in 6(a) of this section).*
   ☒ No (*If no, follow instructions provided in 6(b) of this section*).

   (a) If yes, could a potential release from the proposed facility reach groundwater?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No
   If yes, explain:

   (b) If no:
   (i) Evaluate surrounding soils, topography, and vegetation which may suggest the presence of shallow groundwater.
   (ii) Gather information from surrounding well data in order to determine a depth to groundwater, i.e. State Engineers Office.

7. Is the potential to impact ground water from the facility in the event of a release high or low?
   ☐ High ☒ Low

**Additional Comments:**

As stated in the surface water section of this sensitive area determination, there are no surface water features located within ¼-mile of the proposed facility. The closest USGS identified surface water feature is located 1,960 feet to the northeast. It is not anticipated that a release, if it were to migrate off the facility, would impact the drainage due to: the fairly dense vegetative cover; the moderate to high infiltration rates of the underlying soils; and the distance a release would have to migrate in order to impact the drainage. It is recommended that Best Management Practices (BMPs) be installed on the edges of the proposed facility in the form of a perimeter berm and diversion ditch along the bottom of the fill slopes on the northwestern, northeastern, and southeastern sides. These BMPs should be monitored and maintained to ensure site containment in the event of a release.

The State Engineer's Office and USGS records were reviewed and no records were revealed that would provide additional information pertaining to the depth to groundwater. The vegetative cover in the immediate vicinity of the proposed facility (Piñon Juniper woodland and sage brush) does not suggest the presence of shallow groundwater. It is not anticipated that a potential release would impact groundwater.

Based on the information collected during the desktop review, the potential to impact surface water and ground water has been deemed low. Therefore, the facility should be designated as being in a non-sensitive area.

Inspector Signature(s): _____ Date: 1/13/2011

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

_____ Date: 1/11/2011

Ashlee Lane, *Biologist*
HRL Compliance Solutions, Inc.