4.0 List of Preparers

The ID team for this project includes the following people:

Dwight Devereaux	Recreation Specialist, ID Team Leader
Terry Saarela	Huron-Manistee NF, Mineral Program Manager
Jeff Chynoweth	Mio District Wildlife Biologist
Pat Thompson	Huron Zone Special Uses, Writer, Editor
Dave LaChance	BLM, Geologist

Consultants for this analysis included:

Lauri Hogeboom	Forest NEPA Specialist
Cari VerPlanck	Huron NF Archeologist
Greg Schmidt	Huron NF Botanist
Joe Gomola	Mio District Wildlife Technician

5.0 List of Agencies and Persons Consulted

Table 1. Contacts from Forest Initial Scoping List

First Name	Last Name	Company Name
Jack	Gretzinger	M.U.C.C.
Patricia	Rowell	USDA Forest Service
Caryn	Robinson	
Murray	Daily	
Susan	Thiel	MI Dept of Natural Resouces
Jodi	Kaiser	Forest Resource Alliance
Dwight	Sarget	Inter-Tribal Council of MI, Field Health Office
Mark	Donham	Heartwood
Rusty	Gates	Anglers of the Au Sable
Judith	Soule	Michigan Natural Features Inventory
David	Miehlke	
Peter	Grieves	MI Association of Timbermen
Tim	Karasek	MI Association of Timbermen
Rev. Richard	Pfaff Jr.	SE MI Council of Government
Craig	Schram	NE MI Houndsmen Association
Terry	Warrington	Trout Unlimited
Frank	Laurence	Woodlands
Wayne	Bisballe	Payless Ag. Products, Inc.
Nancy	Shiffler	Sierra Club
Thomas	Buchele	U. of Pittsburg, School of EL Clinic
Tim	Flynn	Sierra Club
Joe	Comella	Trout Unlimited
Ralph	Fankhauser	
Ned	Caveney	
Todd	Johnson	
Ruth Ann	Hodgeland	
Christian	Nihls	
Jason	Dinsmore	MUCC
Dr. Tim	Lewis	Wittenberg University
Marv	Roberson	
Andrew	Laird	
Adam	Bump	Ruffed Grouse Society
Matt	Mauer	
Anne	Woiwode	Sierra Club Mackinac Chapter
Bryan	Bird	Forest Conservation
Ann	Gebhardt	Bay Mills Indian Community
John	Koon	Little River Band of Ottawa Indians
George	Bennett	GT Bay Band of Ottawa & Chippewa
Gerold	Chiengwa	Little Traverse Bay Band of Odawa.
Miles	Falck	G.Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Comm.
Jay	Sam II	Little River Band of Odawa Indians
Phillip	Peters	Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe
Karen	Danielsen	G.Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Comm.
Nottawaseppi	Huron Band	Potawatomi Indians
Doug	Cornett	Northwoods Wilderness Recovery

Additional names (500+) that made comments are in the project file located at the Mio Ranger District Office, Mio, Michigan.

6.0 References

Burford, Robert. 1984. Bureau of Land Management Mineral Resources Policy, May 29. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

Clark, Kathleen and Bosworth, Dale. 2003. Joint Statement on Sustainable Development of Mineral Resources, October 22. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

Hellebuyck, Brian R. 2004. "Noise Impact Assessment for Proposed Production Facility associated with USA & State South Branch 1-8." Hoover & Keith Inc. In the project administrative file at the Mio Ranger District Office, Mio, MI.

Hunter, Malcolm L. 1990. Wildlife, forests, and forestry: Principles of managing forests for biological diversity. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Fisheries Division, 1987. Au Sable River Natural River Plan, pgs. 27-02. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 2004. E-mail form Susan J. Thiel to Dwight Devereaux , "Assessment of Activities in the Mason Tract from 1984 through 2014". June 17. In the project administrative file at the Mio Ranger District Office. Mio, MI.

Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Geological Survey Division. 2002. Michigan's Oil and Gas Regulations. March.

Thomas, Jack Ward. 1995. Forest Service Minerals Program Policy Statement, August 3. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

Thompson, Pat. 2004. Personal communications with Roscommon, Ogemaw, & Crawford Counties' Equalization Directors. May, 26. In the project administrative file at the Mio Ranger District Office. Mio, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 2004. Biological Assessment for the USA & State South Branch 1-8 Well Project. Mio Ranger District Office . Mio, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 2004. Biological Evaluation for the Mio Office Project. Mio Ranger District Office. Mio, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 2001. Environmental Assessment Leasing of 9,500 Acres of Subsurface Federal Oil & Gas Rights. USDA Forest Service. Huron-Manistee National Forests. Cadillac, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 1996. Federal Oil and Gas Leasing in Semiprimitive Nonmotorized Areas, Wild and Scenic River Corridors, Experimental Forests, and for Antrim Shale Development. USDA Forest Service. Huron-Manistee National Forests. Cadillac, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 1988. Amendment 4, Huron–Manistee National Forests, Land and Resource Management Plan. Management Direction for the Au Sable National Scenic River. Eastern Region. USDA Forest Service. Huron-Manistee National Forests. Eastern Region.

Milwaukee, WI. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 1986. Land and Resource Management Plan, Huron- Milwaukee, WI. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

USDA Forest Service. 1986. Final Environmental Impact Statement. Land and Resource Management Plan. Huron-Manistee National Forests. Eastern Region. Milwaukee, WI. USDA
USDA Forest Service. 2000. Huron-Manistee National Forests Monitoring and Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 2000. Forest Service, Cadillac, Michigan.

USDA Forest Service. 2001. Environmental Assessment Leasing of 9,500 Acres of Subsurface Federal Oil & Gas Rights. USDA Forest Service. Huron-Manistee National Forests. Cadillac, MI.

USDI BLM.1986. Policy Statement. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

USDI BLM. 1999. Environmental Assessment for Leasing of Oil and Gas Resources Under a Split Estate Parcel in Michigan. Milwaukee Field Office, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. On file at the Huron-Manistee National Forests' Supervisor's Office. Cadillac, MI.

7.0 Appendix A. Non-significant Issues

Issues that are non-significant are addressed through the design of the project, outside the purpose and need of the project are listed below. The issues have been consolidated with other similar concerns when possible.

1. The proposed drilling and associated development pose a risk of pollution, including oil or brine spills and erosion and drilling muds, to the Au Sable Watershed.

Appropriate measures will be implemented to protect the Au Sable Watershed. The likelihood of direct contamination of the South Branch of the Au Sable due to surface runoff is remote. The river is approximately 2,900 feet from the surface hole location and 2 ¼ miles from the proposed production facility location. All state and federal standards would be met for containment, and disposal of drilling, stimulation, completion, and operational materials and produced fluids. During drilling, plastic liners would be used under the drill rig and in the reserve pit to prevent fluids from reaching groundwater. Stimulation and completion fluids would be stored in steel tanks. These substances would not be permitted in the reserve pit. The excavated lined reserve pit, which would contain drilling fluids and cuttings, would be sized to ensure containment of fluids during drilling operations, including a sufficient amount of excess capacity to include precipitation. During drilling, the operator is required to control sediment and erosion. During production the operator would be required to line the area under storage tanks and maintain a dike around the tanks to contain any potential spills or releases with a capacity or at least 1 ½ times the volume of the largest tank. If deemed necessary, the dike capacity could be increased through additional mitigation.

2. The proposed drilling and associated development would pose a risk to health and safety, i.e. sour gas (H_2S), possible flare out increasing the risk of wildfire, and operator's history of performance.

All state and federal standards and guidelines, including those for hydrogen sulfide operations, would be met for the drilling operation and possible production development. Assuming the well is drilled and is productive; it is not expected to produce H_2S, or sour gas. This is based on knowledge of other Prairie du Chen operations in this part of Michigan. There is a possibility that sour gas may be encountered during drilling operations. The operator has and H_2S contingency plan on file as part of their drilling permit application. This plan is required by BLM regulations. The operator must comply with the MLM Onshore Order #6, Hydrogen Sulfide Operations and State of Michigan regulations. These regulations outline the operator's responsibility and requirements for drilling under potential sour gas conditions and are designed for the safety and health of the drill rig workers as well as the public. If excess gas is encountered during drilling operations, this gas may be flared. The design of the wellsite ensures a safe distance between nearby fuel sources (i.e. trees/grasses/shrubs) and the point at which these gases are released. During well testing, there could be a visible flame seen at times as it is the standard practice to burn off excessive gases during the well drilling and testing phases. State and/or Federal personnel would be on-site to monitor the testing.

Drilling is limited to December 1 through April 15. Fire danger during this time would be monitored and is typically low. Contingency plans submitted by Savoy include items to reduce the potential risk of a wildfire occurring as part of the industry standard and government requirements used to insure the safety of the workers and the public.

According to Rick Henderson, District Supervisor, Cadillac District, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Savoy has no reportable violations at any of the production and/or well site facilities currently in operation.

3. The proposed drilling and associated facilities will reduce Kirtland's warbler (KW) habitat.

The well site and production facility locations are not within the area identified as essential habitat even though the production facility is within the Eldorado Kirtland's Warbler Area. The area around the production facility would not be managed for KW. Approximately 1 mile of the pipeline is adjacent to essential habitat. However, once installed, it would not preclude the management of the adjacent area for KW. The biological assessment /evaluation determined there would be no effect on the Kirtland's warbler. (Section 3.2)

4. The proposed drilling and associated development would reduce ecosystem health and fragment wildlife habitat.

This is addressed in the Predicted Effects on Wildlife, Threatened, Sensitive and Endangered Species, and Management Indicator Species (MIS), Section 3.4.

5. The proposed activities would bring economic benefits to the oil company, and no one else.

This is outside the scope of the project. The proponent has legal rights to the exploration and development of the mineral interest(s) as identified in their leases for the specific resource. If exploration is successful, federal royalty revenue from the resulting production would be distributed to the federal treasury and the state /local county

6. The returns to the State Trust Funds would be insignificant.

This is outside the scope of the project. The proponent has a legal right to fully explore and develop the resource as stated in their lease and the percentage of revenues allocated to the State trust fund is established by the State of Michigan.

7. The State Trust Fund is not being used to protect "wild" areas.

This is outside the scope of the project. The State Trust Fund is managed and administered by the State of Michigan, not Federal agencies.

8. There is no economic need for this project.

This is outside the scope of the project. The proponent has a legal right to fully explore and develop the resource as stated in their lease.

9. Oil and gas development is an inappropriate use of Federal land or Natural Rivers.

This is outside the scope of the project. Current federal and state laws recognize oil and gas development of federal and state mineral resources. See Decisions Already Made. Section 1.4.

10. The proposed drilling and associated development will degrade nearby wetlands.

The operator will not be permitted to occupy wetland areas for drilling or production. All state and federal standards and guidelines would be met for the protection of wetlands including spill prevention and containment plans for the drilling, operation of production facilities, and transporting materials through pipelines and tankers.

A silt fence will be placed between the wetland and FSR 4209.

11. The proposed drilling and associated development will result in reduced property values for landowners in the area.

In personal discussions with Crawford, Roscommon, and Ogemaw Counties' Equalization Directors, they stated that no value adjustments are made in sales of private vacant land near or next to oil and gas facilities, or wells, including sour gas in their respective counties. Adjustments in value are made if a property is contaminated for any reason, does not have access, has wetlands, or requires buried utility lines. If contaminant remediation of the property is completed, it does not affect the value. Adjustments may or may not occur depending on why the property was purchased.

The Directors review annual sales in their respective counties to establish trends and property values. Properties with improvements (houses) are not easily compared because of the many building variables that may influence the value. However, if people purchase vacant land, there is an assumption that they may build on the property, again, depending on why the property was purchased.

The proposed site is approximately ½ mile south of the nearest private parcel located in W ½, Section 5, T25N, R1W. An existing well and production facility, along Hickey Creek Road, south of the proposed location in Section 19, has not deterred year-round and seasonal homes in the area.

There is also the opposite view that nearby oil or gas development increases property values. Development infers that if you own mineral rights to your surface property, there may be an opportunity to gain financially from the sale of those mineral rights. This could be perceived as an increase in the value of the property.

12. The proposed drilling and associated development could have a negative impact on the local economy because of a reduction in tourism to the area.

In personal discussions with a Forest Economist in East Lansing, Michigan, there are many variables that influence the local economy and specifically tourism, not just one thing. Any new development could affect the local economy, not just oil and gas development.

Other wells drilled in the vicinity, Hickey Creek, have not reduced the amount of tourism to the area. In total there are currently 284 producing oil and gas wells in Crawford Count. As stated in #11 there are no negative land value trends seen in surrounding areas where oil and gas

wells and production facilities are already developed. Mitigation measures would be incorporated into the SUPO as conditions of approval to reduce the long-term noise of any equipment and machinery on the well site or production facility. Also, at the current proposed location, the wellhead would not be visible to visitors in the Mason tract, and the Mason Chapel. Visitors may meet heavy equipment and transport vehicles along the River Lake Road or FSR 4029 during exploration and if productive, during installation of the pipelines and construction of the production facility. After that, maintenance and operational visits would be daily and could be reduced to one pick-up truck/one visit/day.

13. The proposed drilling and associated development would lead to additional industrial development in the area.

Savoy identified the area south and east of the proposed production facility for foreseeable future development. No additional development is expected in the SPNM area at this time. See Existing & Reasonable Foreseeable Oil & Gas Development Scenario, Section 3.1.