



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Joint Pipeline Office
411 West 4th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99501
<http://www.ak.blm.gov>

Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) and Land Use Plan Conformance

Right-of-Way Grant to Authorize Land Use for Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan Containment Sites along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System

DNA AK-993-06-009

A. BLM Office: Joint Pipeline Office (JPO)

BLM Case File No. FF094972

Applicant: Alyeska Pipeline Service Company, P.O. Box 196660, MS 502, Anchorage, AK 99519-6660

Proposed Action Summary: BLM proposes to grant a right-of-way to Alyeska Pipeline Service Company (Alyeska), operator of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS), to authorize long-term land use outside of the TAPS Right-of-Way for the purpose of establishing and maintaining twenty-seven oil discharge prevention and contingency plan containment sites on lands adjacent to water bodies north of Atigun Pass.

Purpose and Need of Action: The purpose of the proposed action is to authorize land use for Alyeska to establish and maintain oil discharge prevention and contingency plan containment sites on lands adjacent to water bodies along TAPS. The underlying need for the proposed action is BLM's requirement for pipeline operator compliance with the Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and Related Facilities, Stipulation 2.14, Contingency Plans, and Stipulation 3.11, Containment of Oil Spills. Alyeska's *Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Pipeline Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan* (CP-35-1, Ed. 4, Rev. 1, 12/31/03) specifies that Alyeska be prepared for quick response in event of an oil spill from the pipeline system. In accordance with the Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the TAPS and Related Facilities, BLM reviews and approves Alyeska's oil spill contingency plan (C-Plan) on an annual basis. Alyeska's ability to respond in the event of an oil spill is part of the C-Plan review and approval. The oil discharge prevention and contingency plan containment sites are an integral part of the C-Plan.

Location and Legal Land Descriptions of Proposed Action: The 27 oil discharge prevention and contingency plan containment site areas will be located on lands along the Trans-Alaska

Pipeline extending north from Atigun Pass to approximately pipeline milepost (PLMP) 117. The sites are located along various tributaries and water bodies that include the Sagavanirktok (Sag) River, Kuparuk River, and Atigun River systems. These sites reside within Area 1 of the C-Plan and are on lands under the jurisdiction of the BLM Fairbanks District Office. The location and legal land descriptions of the 27 sites are:

- 1) 3-4: Oks Creek - located where pipeline workpad crosses Oks Creek; conex @ PLMP 117.1 in wide area of workpad. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 13 E., sec. 4, NE1/4NE1/4.
- 2) 3-7: Toolik River Tributaries – located where two Toolik River tributaries join. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 12 E., sec. 2, N1/2NE1/4NE1/4.
- 3) 3-9: Oks Creek – located where Dalton Highway crosses Oks Creek, approximately Dalton Highway milepost (DHMP) 297.8. Conex is 1.9 miles south at access road 118 APL-1. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 13 E., sec. 4, SE1/4SW1/4.
- 4) 3-11: E. Fork Kuparuk River – located at north end of pond on East Fork Kuparuk River, approximately 1.5 river miles from the pipeline and 2.0 river miles from the Dalton Highway. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 12 E., sec. 8, S1/2SW1/4SE1/4; sec. 17, N1/2NW1/4NE1/4.
- 5) 3-12: Kuparuk River – located on south shore of Kuparuk River, approximately 5 river miles from pipeline. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 11 E., sec. 13, NW1/4NE1/4.
- 6) 3-14: Kuparuk River – located on northwest shore of Kuparuk River, approximately 0.5 miles north of Dalton Highway and 0.6 miles north of pipeline. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 12 E., sec. 19, SW1/4NW1/4.
- 7) 3-15: Becky Creek – located beside access road 116 APL-6 where road crosses Becky Creek, approximately 1/8-mile from Dalton Highway, DHMP 288.9. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 12 E., sec. 19, NE1/4SW1/4.
- 8) 3-15A: Kuparuk River – located where workpad crosses Kuparuk River, approximately PLMP 126.6. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 12 E., sec. 19, NE1/4SW1/4.
- 9) 3-16: Becky Creek – located where workpad crosses Becky Creek, approximately PLMP 128.7. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 11 E., sec. 35, SE1/4NE1/4.
- 10) 3-17: South Inlet Toolik Lake – located at north end of pond, where pond drains into Toolik Lake. Umiat Meridian, T. 10 S., R. 11 E., sec. 5, NE1/4NE1/4.
- 11) 3-18: Toolik Lake – located on south end Toolik Lake where Toolik River drains into lake. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 11 E., sec. 32, NW1/4NE1/4.
- 12) 3-19: Kuparuk River tributary – located at north end of Toolik Lake where Kuparuk River tributary leaves lake. Conex is beside road that leads from Toolik Lake Airstrip to Toolik Camp. Umiat Meridian, T. 9 S., R. 11 E., sec. 29, NE1/4NE1/4.
- 13) 3-20: Jill Creek – located along Jill Creek at northwest outlet of small lake, approximately 2.1 air miles from where workpad crosses Jill Creek. Umiat Meridian, T. 10 S., R. 11 E., sec. 22, SW1/4SW1/4.
- 14) 3-21: Lake Outlet, Jill Creek – located on Jill Creek, at west outlet of small lake. Umiat Meridian, T. 10 S., R. 11 E., sec. 21, SW1/4SW1/4.
- 15) 3-22: Galbraith Lake Slough – located beside outlet of Galbraith Lake in Galbraith Lake Slough, approximately 2.0 river miles from Atigun River/Dalton Highway bridge. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 12 E., sec. 30, SE1/4SW1/4.

- 16) 3-23: Atigun River – located where Atigun River meets Sag River. Umiat Meridian, T. 10 S., R. 13 E., sec. 35, SW1/4SE1/4.
- 17) 3-24: Galbraith Lake Inlet – located at north end of Galbraith Lake where inlet flows into lake. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 11 E., sec. 24, NW1/4NW1/4.
- 18) 3-25: Island Lake Outlet – located at south end of Island Lake at unnamed creek outlet, approximately 1 mile west of Dalton Highway. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 11 E., sec. 2, NE1/4SW1/4.
- 19) 3-26: Galbraith tributary – located where Galbraith Airport Road crosses Galbraith Tributary. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 11 E., sec. 14, NW1/4NW1/4.
- 20) 3-27: Dillon’s Run – located beside Dillon’s Run, northwest of pond, approximately ¾-mile northwest of Galbraith Lake. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 11 E., sec. 14, S1/2SW1/4NE1/4 and N1/2NW1/4SE1/4.
- 21) 3-28: Unnamed Creek – located on unnamed creek leading from pond to Galbraith Lake Slough. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 12 E., sec. 30, SE1/4SW1/4NE1/4, SW1/4SE1/4NE1/4, NE1/4NW1/4SE1/4, and NW1/4NE1/4SE1/4.
- 22) 3-29: Atigun River – located on Atigun River, northwest of Dalton Highway bridge, DHMP 270.8. Umiat Meridian, T. 11 S., R. 12 E., sec. 32, NE1/4NW1/4.
- 23) 3-30: Dwyer’s Diddy Creek – located on Dwyer’s Diddy Creek, just east of Dalton Highway, DHMP 269.9. Umiat Meridian, T. 12 S., R. 12 E., sec. 5, NE1/4NW1/4.
- 24) 3-31: Unnamed Creek – located where unnamed creek flows into Atigun River, approximately 0.5 miles west of Pump Station 4. Umiat Meridian, T. 12 S., R. 12 E., sec. 8, S1/2NW1/4NW1/4 and N1/2SW1/4NW1/4.
- 25) 3-32: Atigun River – located beside Atigun River near end of access road 113 APL-1. Umiat Meridian, T. 13 S., R. 12 E., sec. 4, NE1/4NE1/4.
- 26) 3-33: Atigun River – located just off workpad @ PLMP 159.6. Umiat Meridian, T. 14 S., R. 12 E., sec. 20, SW1/4NE1/4.
- 27) 3-34: Atigun River – located on west side of Dalton Highway, approximately DHMP 247.4, PLMP 165.2, just north of where highway crosses workpad; where Stem Creek flows into Atigun River. Umiat Meridian, T. 15 S., R. 12 E., sec. 18, SE1/4SW1/4.

Description/Scope of Work for Proposed Action:

The proposed activity will occur in an area previously and extensively modified by human use. The activity will be light surface use and is expected to have minimal impact in the land use area. Stipulation 2.14 of the Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the TAPS requires Alyeska to have a Contingency Plan (C-Plan) that addresses how to proceed in the event of an oil spill. The C-Plan includes detailed information for reconnaissance, response, and containment actions in the event of an oil spill along the pipeline. One aspect of the C-Plan is the designation of containment sites on BLM-managed lands for the placement of emergency oil spill containment equipment. Agency and Alyeska planners worked together to identify approximately 220 containment sites, half of which are on Federal land. Over time, Alyeska’s oil spill exercise program expanded and many of the sites were used for training. During the summers of 2004 and 2005, the containment sites were resurveyed and detailed drawings were made for the sites to include staging areas, landing zones, and detailed response strategies for each site. Some sites contain helicopter landing zones, portable anchors, storage Conexes for spill response equipment, and/or culvert staging kits.

For oil spill response, Alyeska divided the pipeline into regions, contingency areas, and segments. These divisions are based on water drainage systems. The region boundaries are major river drainages that TAPS intersects, resulting in five regions. Each region plan is divided into contingency areas. A contingency area generally covers a distinct drainage pattern. The contingency areas are further subdivided into segments for containment actions, access and environmental information. The 27 sites in this Right-of-Way Grant proposal fall within Area 1.

According to the C-Plan, the specific contingency area plans include primary containment sites and containment zones which are designed to minimize damage to sensitive areas. Dependent on the magnitude of the spill and environmental conditions, on-scene initial responders may be required to devise additional containment measures and locations. For example, where feasible, an additional containment site to recover as much oil as possible will be established farther downstream at the leading edge of the spill.

Approximately every three years, or on an as-needed basis, the containment sites are brushed according to the Typical Containment Site Standby Grooming Plan to ensure quick access in the event of a spill. The grooming activities are performed with hand tools and do not disturb the soil cover or root systems of plants. No gravel or other imported material is placed on the sites. The grooming involves a small number of people and a limited amount of time – only enough to touch up the brushing and ensure access still exists.

Alyeska holds oil spill drills every three to five years. The drills take place at the containment sites, depending on the location of the drill. During a drill, a large number of people are deployed to the site ranging from a few hours to several days. In the event of an oil spill, a containment site may be occupied by twenty people for several months, depending on progress in containing the oil and cleanup after the spill.

Authorities: The Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act of 1973 (TAPAA) (43 U.S.C. § 1652) and Section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, 30 U.S.C. § 185; 43 Code of Federal Regulations 2880 Rights-of-Way Under the Mineral Leasing Act; National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969; and the Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the TAPS and Related Facilities; 40 CFR 112, “Oil Pollution Prevention.”

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

The project activity will occur on federal lands managed by BLM Alaska which were withdrawn as a utility corridor under Public Land Order 5150, December 28, 1971. The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable land use plans as required by 43 CFR 1610.5, although this project is not specifically addressed, because it is clearly consistent with the objectives, terms and conditions with the following Land Use Plan decisions:

1. The *BLM Utility Corridor Resource Management Plan* (RMP), approved January 11, 1991.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

1) *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Renewal of the Federal Grant for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Right-of-Way*, U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management Joint Pipeline Office, BLM-AK-PT-03-005-2880-990, November 2002. The BLM completed a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that identified and analyzed the probable direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with renewal of the TAPS Right-of-Way. The FEIS and the Record of Decision stated there were no probable significant adverse environmental impacts from the TAPS Right-of-Way authorization and continued operation and maintenance along TAPS for an additional 30 years.

2) *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline*, Prepared by a Special Interagency Task Force for the Federal Task Force on Alaskan Oil Development, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1972. The U.S. Department of Interior completed a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that identified and analyzed the probable direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts associated with the construction, operation and maintenance of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System for the first 30-year term of the Right-of-Way Grant. The Record of Decision stated there were no probable significant adverse environmental impacts from the TAPS Right-of-Way authorization and continued operation and maintenance along TAPS. This was the first comprehensive NEPA analysis document completed for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System and the first EIS completed after passage of the National Environmental Policy Act in 1969.

3) Programmatic Environmental Assessment for TAPS Pipeline Maintenance Activities, EA No. AK-993-04-001, March 26, 2004. This EA analyzed impacts of Alyeska's routine maintenance and protection of the TAPS, including the location and maintenance of oil spill contingency plan sites, and updated a Programmatic EA No. 96-002, completed January 4, 1996. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) found that no significant environmental impact resulted from the location, maintenance, and access to oil spill contingency plan containment sites along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action.

1. *The Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Pipeline Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan*, CP-35-1, Ed. 4, Rev. 3, December 5, 2005.
2. The Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and Related Facilities, January 8, 2003.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Are the current proposed actions substantially the same actions or part of those actions as previously analyzed?

The proposed actions are part of the actions that were previously analyzed in the *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Renewal of the Federal Grant for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Right-of-Way*, U. S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management Joint

Pipeline Office, BLM-AK-PT-03-005-2880-990, November 2002, Section 3.1-14, Oil Spill Emergency Response. The FEIS states:

“The TAPS is required to comply with the TAPS Oil Discharge Prevention and Contingency Plan (CP-35-1) approved every three years by multiple federal and state agencies. The plan covers the following: (1) equipment and resources and field training for spill responders; (2) electronic leak detection capabilities; (3) improved leak detection and leak prevention alarm systems for pump station tanks; (4) *more than 220 sites along the pipeline ROW designated as oil spill equipment staging and deployment areas*, and dedicated oil spill contingency plan buildings and equipment at each pump station; (5) mutual aid agreements with villages near the pipeline to use residents and equipment in the event of a spill; (6) 12 spill scenarios covering a variety of terrain, oil products, spill volumes, and seasonal conditions; and (7) aerial photographs of the pipeline to aid in spill response planning.”

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents appropriate with respect to the current proposed actions, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action. This proposed activity was previously analyzed in the *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Renewal of the Federal Grant for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System Right-of-Way*, BLM-AK-PT-03-005-2880-990, November 2002, and the first TAPS NEPA analysis, the *Final Environmental Impact Statement, Proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline 1972*. Both documents analyzed oil spill response activities and environmental concerns about oil spill response preparedness. The C-Plan requires Alyeska to conduct oil spill drill and exercise activities to be prepared in the event of an oil spill from TAPS. No adverse environmental impacts are expected to occur as the result of conducting drills for emergency oil spill response exercises. No surface disturbance will occur. Alternative No. 12 of the FEIS discussed oil spill response capabilities.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances, for example, most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species and most recent BLM lists of sensitive species? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

The Record of Decision for the TAPS Renewal FEIS states:

“Pursuant to the Endangered Species Act, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and Essential Fish Habitat provision of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the BLM initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, the BLM prepared the Biological Evaluation of the Effects of Right-of-Way Renewal for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System on Threatened and Endangered Species and Designated Critical Habitat (Biological Evaluation), dated

June 2002. The Biological Evaluation identified five species of concern within the action area: spectacled eider, Steller's eider, humpback whale, fin whale, and Steller sea lion. It found there was no designated critical habitat within the action area for the TAPS renewal. The Biological Evaluation concluded that the proposed action was not likely to adversely affect the five species or any critical habitat. The National Marine Fisheries Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service each concurred with BLM's determination that the proposed action would not adversely affect the species of concern. BLM prepared an Essential Fish Habitat analysis. The National Marine Fisheries Service concurred that the Essential Fish Habitat consultation requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act have been satisfied and further concurred with BLM's determination that any short-term adverse effects on Essential Fish Habitat can be adequately avoided, minimized and mitigated by the conservation measures associated with the proposed action."

4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA documents continue to be appropriate for the current proposed actions?

The methodology and analytical approaches used in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate for the current proposed action. All of the documents addressed the aspects of the affected environment and environmental consequences for soils, permafrost, sand and gravel; surface water and groundwater resources, air quality, noise, terrestrial vegetation, wetlands and riparian zones; fish, birds, mammals, threatened and endangered species, land use, economy, subsistence, environmental justice, cultural resources, recreational and visual resources, transportation, hazardous materials and waste management, and oil spill contingency plans. The TAPS Renewal EIS of November 2002 systematically addressed cumulative impacts, mitigation and other NEPA considerations. The oil spill response practice drills and exercises are a mitigation measure to protect the environment in event of a TAPS oil spill.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents? Do the existing NEPA documents sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action do not deviate from the impacts identified in the existing NEPA documents. Site-specific impacts related to the current proposal were sufficiently analyzed in the previous EISs.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents?

The cumulative impacts from the proposed action have not changed from the impacts analyzed in the 2002 TAPS FEIS for Right-of-Way Renewal. The FEIS contains an extensive discussion of the cumulative effects of TAPS operations for the 30-year renewal period.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA documents adequate for the current proposed actions?

The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA documents are adequate for the current proposed action due to the following:

1) Public Involvement. The TAPS FEIS for Renewal underwent an exhaustive public involvement process. BLM enlisted all interested stakeholders in the renewal process, including government-to-government involvement with Alaska tribes, state and federal agencies that regulate TAPS activities, and special interest groups affected by TAPS activities. The entire renewal process, including all public hearings and meetings, received extensive coverage by newspaper, television, and radio media.

2) Interagency Review. During the TAPS Renewal EIS process, BLM coordinated closely with the State of Alaska, as well as all JPO State and Federal stakeholder agencies and other Federal land management agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service. The TAPS FEIS for Renewal contains interagency reviews by the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Alaska Region, which concurred with the BLM finding that any short-term effects can be adequately avoided, minimized, and mitigated by the conservation measures associated with the proposed action.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis. Identify those team members consulted or participating in the preparation of this document.

1. Patricia Perry, Realty Specialist, BLM
2. Lois Simenson, Realty Specialist, BLM
3. Stan Bronczyk, Realty Specialist, BLM
4. Rebecca Lewis, Environmental Specialist, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
5. Mike Wrabetz, Environmental Protection Specialist, BLM
6. Bonnie Friedman, Oil Spill Response and Prevention, BLM Contractor
7. Howard Smith, Archaeologist, BLM Fairbanks District Office (FDO)
8. William H. Hedman, Archaeologist, BLM FDO, Central Yukon Field Office

F. OTHER NEPA CONSIDERATIONS

1. Cultural Resources

The Assessment of Archaeological and Historic Resources, Fairbanks District Office report, dated September 14, 2006, prepared by the district office archaeologist, organized the various containment sites into four groups and provided recommendations for each group. The recommendations for all groups assume an archaeologist will be present in the event of an oil spill and that additional efforts may be necessary at that time to avoid or mitigate impacts to cultural resources.

The first group consists of containment sites located adjacent to the highway or pipeline where it is logical to assume past archaeological survey for pipeline construction would have discovered any historic or prehistoric sites. Also included are containment sites in the vicinity of Toolik and Galbraith Lakes where extensive archaeological inventory has been completed. The following

sites are included in this group and require no additional inventory: 3-4, 3-9, 3-15, 3-15A, 3-16, 3-18, 3-19, 3-22, 3-24, 3-25, 3-26, 3-27, 3-28, 3-30, 3-32, 3-33, and 3-34.

The second group consists of containment sites for which on-the-ground inventory is not recommended based on examination of high-level and low-level aerial photographs, as well as photographs taken at ground surface. The following containment sites are included in this group and require no additional inventory: 3-11, 3-12, 3-14, 3-17, and 3-23.

The third group consists of containment sites for which additional inventory is recommended due to the potential of conflict with cultural resources. The following containment sites are included in this group: 3-20, 3-21, 3-29, and 3-31. After further consultation with a second Fairbanks District Office archaeologist, additional stipulations were agreed to which state that the containment sites in question will undergo field inventory in 2007. Until the field inventories are completed, no surface-disturbing activity will take place on these sites.

Containment site (CS) 3-29 is located within an area identified as “sensitive – red” in the *PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT AMONG THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, THE ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, THE ALASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER, AND THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION - Regarding Consideration and Management of Historic Properties Affected by Operations and Maintenance Activities Along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System*, dated September 2005. If ground-disturbing activity were to take place at CS 3-29, Alyeska will follow the procedures described in Section III (TAPS Cultural Resource Compliance Process) of the Programmatic Agreement.

The fourth group is two containment sites that were visited during the 2005 and 2006 field seasons. No containment sites in the area of this ROW grant are included in the fourth group.

Containment site 3-7 was added to the grant application on Dec. 28, 2006. It was included in a group of sites reviewed by the State of Alaska, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, Office of History and Archaeology, and was found to not require further evaluation.

2. ANILCA Section 810 Subsistence Evaluation

The TAPS Renewal Record of Decision signed January 8, 2003 contained the following conclusion: BLM determined that the effect of the proposed action on subsistence would not significantly restrict subsistence uses. BLM undertook a series of public hearings to review the effects of the TAPS on subsistence and published a notice in the Federal Register July 5, 2002, that cumulative impacts may significantly restrict subsistence uses. BLM held public hearings throughout Alaska in Cordova, Valdez, Glennallen, Anchorage, Fairbanks, Minto, and Barrow, between July 26 and August 9, 2002. Based on the hearings and the Section 810 evaluation, BLM concluded:

- 1) TAPS Renewal activities would not significantly affect the subsistence rights of rural Alaskans. Some small or slight impacts might occur under a renewal for thirty years. The subsistence impacts likely related to the TAPS potentially would be (1) limited reduced access to portions of subsistence use areas, and (2) possible disruptions to the

movement of game. It is likely that the magnitude of these consequences would be very small and would not significantly restrict subsistence uses.

2) Since the TAPS is constructed and is an operational system, there is no other land available to accomplish the purpose sought to be achieved. The proposed action will involve the minimal amount of public lands necessary to accomplish the purpose of renewing TAPS.

3) There is no other alternative that would reduce or eliminate the use of public lands needed for subsistence purposes and accomplish the public purpose.

Environmental Impacts – The January 2003 Record of Decision for TAPS Renewal authorized renewal of the right-of-way under the administration of the Department of the Interior with the understanding that the monitoring and mitigation that is currently required and operative shall be followed as directed by the Authorized Officer. Mitigation measures include those covered by technical, environmental, and general stipulations of the Federal Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way. The FEIS stated:

“The unavoidable adverse impacts under the renewal of the Grant for another 30 years are small and may be mitigated or offset by the positive aspects of the actions. There would be continued localized impacts to the environment as a result of operation, construction, and maintenance activities, such as soil and vegetation disturbances, the use of surface and groundwater resources, and air emissions. However, such impacts are readily mitigated through measures already in place.”

3. Mitigation Measures

1. The Right-of-Way Grant shall be subject to the terms, conditions and stipulations of the Renewal of the Agreement and Grant of Right-of-Way for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and Related Facilities between the United States of America and Amerada Hess Corporation, et al., dated January 8, 2003, which became effective on January 24, 2004. It shall be provided, however, that in the event of a conflict, either express or implied, between any provisions of the Federal Agreement for TAPS and any provision of this ROW Grant, such conflict shall be resolved in favor of this ROW Grant.
2. No surface-disturbing activity will take place at containment sites 3-20, 3-21, 3-29, or 3-31 prior to archaeological field inventory, which we expect to be completed by mid-summer 2007. In addition, since containment site (CS) 3-29 is located within an area identified as “sensitive – red” in the *Programmatic Agreement Regarding Consideration and Management of Historic Properties Affected by Operations and Maintenance Activities Along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System*, dated September 2005, if ground-disturbing activity were to take place at CS 3-29, Alyeska will follow the procedures described in Section III (TAPS Cultural Resource Compliance Process) of the Programmatic Agreement.
3. Upon expiration or termination of use, the land area shall be restored to the satisfaction of the Authorized Officer and in accordance with 43 CFR 2885.11(b) Terms and Conditions of Use.

4. Primary access shall be limited to the work pad and existing roads, unless specifically authorized in writing.
 5. The Grant area limits shall be staked prior to commencement of any Conex placement activities.
 6. If the natural vegetation is disturbed as a result of the permittee's activities, the disturbed areas shall be returned to their original or normal physical condition and natural productivity and diversity with re-establishment of native plant species, as soon as practicable, to the satisfaction of the Authorized Officer, as stated in writing.
 7. Land use activity, including any construction, shall be conducted to minimize disturbance to existing vegetation.
 8. Fuel storage is not allowed within the Grant area.
 9. Temporary trash storage is not allowed in the Grant area. Waste materials will be removed from the Grant area to appropriate facilities on a regular basis.
 10. The Authorized Officer may require that his authorized representative be onsite during operations conducted under this Grant.
 11. The permittee shall inform and ensure compliance with these stipulations by its agents, employees, and contractors (including subcontractors at any level).
 12. This Grant applies to lands under jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management.
 13. There shall be no damage to or disturbance of any archaeological or historical sites and artifacts, including prehistoric stone tools and sites, historic log cabins, remnants of such structures, refuse dumps, and graves, and no collection of any artifacts whatsoever. In addition, collection of vertebrate fossils, including mammoths and mastodon bones, tusks, etc., is strictly prohibited. If historic or archaeological resources are encountered, the procedures as outlined in the *Programmatic Agreement Regarding Consideration and Management of Historic Properties Affected by Operations and Maintenance Activities Along the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System*, dated September 2005, will be followed.
-

