

Pipeline Revegetation Techniques

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS IN PLANNING AND ROUTING NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE

by G. F. Carpenter

Natural gas pipeline development impacts all aspects of the natural environment. This paper concerns natural gas pipeline routes in Michigan but its findings are applicable to other states and other types of rights-of-way such as electrical transmission corridors or roads. A search for right-of-way (ROW) locations must be concerned with land use and natural resources: land value, air quality, water quality, soils, wildlife, vegetation and aesthetics. The Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) has developed nineteen routing criteria to aid in the protection of these natural resources. Although the use of off-road vehicles (ORV) in pipeline rights-of-way presents special problems, with proper planning, they can be constructed and maintained in a manner compatible with both man and his environment.


Why all the Concern for the Environment?

Because of the enabling legislation, the Michigan Public Service Commission has a mandate to ensure the safe and cost efficient construction and operation of pipelines. In addition, the Anderson-Rockwell Environmental Protection Act (1980, P.A. 127) and the Governor's Executive Order 19074-4 imposes the duty on all state agencies to prevent or minimize environmental degradation. Similar legislative mandates exist in other states and federally for interstate projects. Finally, the public demands that aesthetics and human and natural resource protection be given equal consideration with economics in planning and authorizing development. Historically, safety and economic considerations, as controlled by the Michigan Gas Safety Code, have

been paramount. In recent years, particularly in connection with development in northern Michigan, environmental considerations have held increasing importance.

Two events have had great impact on the increasing importance of the environment in natural gas pipeline development. These are the discovery and development of important hydrocarbon reserves in the northern lower peninsula of Michigan (known as the northern Niagaran Trend) and the "No Flare Order" issued by the Supervisor of Wells of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). The No Flare Order prevents waste of natural gas by flaring or venting, so wells which produce both crude oil and natural gas must provide for the collection of gas. The order results in the need for natural gas pipelines because, in contrast to crude oil production, it is safer and more efficient to transport gas by pipeline than by truck. The discovery of hydrocarbons in northern Michigan greatly increased the number of pipelines needed, resulting in a relatively large commitment of land. While this commitment may amount to only a small percentage of land in the Niagaran Trend, it is occurring in a popular recreation area affecting both private and state-owned property. The resulting public awareness and visibility have thrust environmental considerations into prominence in pipeline activities. The MPSC goal is to avoid pipeline disruption of sensitive environmental areas of habitats where feasible and prudent alternatives exist.

Sensitive areas are those which are least able to accommodate a pipeline without fundamental changes in their composition or structure. In Michigan,



George F. Carpenter is an Environmental Specialist for the Michigan Public Service Commission where he is responsible for pipeline right of way review. He also evaluates aquatic impacts of Michigan power plants. Carpenter was previously in charge of the Environmental Toxicology Lab at Hazleton Environmental Sciences where one of his projects was investigating the toxicology of a major oil spill in the North Sea. He is a Ph.D. candidate at Michigan State University.

the habitats most sensitive to environmental disruption are streams and wetlands (Crabtree, et al, 1978). Stream impacts include destruction of banks, siltation from construction and erosion, destruction of fish cover, replacement of fish spawning beds, and heating because of pooling and removal of shading vegetation. Wetland impacts include dessication from sun and wind exposure; die back, sunscald and windthrow of shallow rooted trees along the right of way (ROW); little or no regrowth of slow-growing species; invasion by fast-growing opportunistic species; and loss of wildlife cover and breeding habitat. These and other habitats, such as uplands, can also

(see Habitats, pg. 30)

Habitats (cont. from pg. 29)

suffer from drainage pattern alterations which result in flooding on one side of a ROW and drying on the other because of damming or soils compaction.

Upland hardwood or conifer stands are less susceptible than wetlands and streams to damage, although clearing and the resulting "bowling alley" effect can be quite noticeable (Figure 1). It is here that aesthetic effects become more important. There is a danger that indiscriminantly placed right-of-way can subdivide or carve contiguous forests into smaller parcels altering the forest habitat and opening it to invasion. This can place increasing pressure and reduce the range of wildlife species which prefer large or isolated areas. Carefully placed, however, a ROW can enhance habitat diversity by creating an edge effect in the vegetation and providing food and cover for a great variety of wildlife. Open fields, either wild or agriculture, are even less susceptible to environmental damage or aesthetic impact because vegetation clearing is minor and mitigation in the form of restoring the land grade and reseedling can quickly hide the land disturbance.

Habitat sensitivity rating based on this information can be a useful tool in planning the location for a new ROW. The MPSC has developed an impact rating system for use in natural gas pipeline routing in Michigan (Sicuranza and Carpenter, (1980)). The approach starts with a land use and vegetative cover classification system developed by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR, 1976) and extends into a constraint map system. Other evaluation and rating systems such as Habitat Evaluation Procedures (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1980) or the



Figure 1. The "bowling alley" effect of electrical transmission line corridors.

NUROP (numerical rating of parameters) system (Stanford, 1980) are available for evaluating alternate routes or examining land use and wildlife habitat changes and their value.

How can ROW Impact be Controlled?

Environmental guidelines have evolved out of the studies reported by Crabtree et al (1978) and Sicuranza and Carpenter (1980) as well as natural gas pipeline certification proceedings before the Michigan Public Service Commission (Table 1). These guidelines are intended for use by the utilities during the planning and construction of new pipelines but can be extended to any new ROW or facility siting project. A further intent is to acquaint the utility with the criteria that the MPSC staff will apply when reviewing a pipeline route application.

The guidelines are not exclusive and, in fact, can conflict with each other. The reason is that ROW routing is a dynamic exercise which requires balancing decisions based on safety, economics, and the environment. For example, the first three guidelines are

intentionally conflicting. Commit the least amount of land possible means that a straight-line route is most economical, as long as physical barriers or environmentally sensitive areas which should be avoided (the second guideline) aren't present. The third guideline, utilize existing right-of-way, provides a less impactful means for crossing an environmentally sensitive area and also carries the warning that subdividing land units when nearby existing right-of-way can be used, is not desirable. Therefore, a more expensive deviation from the straight line route can be justified if significant environmental, aesthetic, or land use impact can be avoided.

The fourth guideline, minimize ROW clearing, exists because it is more expensive and aesthetically damaging to clear and then rehabilitate a wider ROW than that needed for construction purposes. A corollary to this guideline is to allow vegetation to regrow in part of the ROW, leaving only enough open area for inspection and emergency access purposes. Regrowth maximizes the benefit of habitat diversification in a

(see Guidelines, pg. 31)

Table 1. Planning and Mitigation Guidelines Developed by Michigan Public Service Commission Staff

- 1) Commit the least amount of land possible to pipeline use.
- 2) Avoid environmentally sensitive areas whenever possible.
- 3) Utilize existing rights-of-way whenever environmentally and economically prudent.
- 4) Minimize clearing on the right-of-way.
- 5) Avoid crossing cold water streams if a feasible and reasonable alternative exists.
- 6) Control silt and sediment during aquatic construction by using the plow method or dewatering the trench.
- 7) Cross streams at right angles, at the narrowest point, and in areas of shallow stream banks.
- 8) Implement stream bank repair and protection immediately following construction.
- 9) Avoid wetlands whenever possible.
- 10) Cross wetlands at the narrowest point, following existing rights-of-way, and build during the period of minimum wildlife activity.
- 11) Begin construction during low water levels.
- 12) Protect and reestablish wetland drainage patterns using culverts or other aids.
- 13) Minimize the number of construction vehicles and their frequency of travel to control soil compaction in wetlands.
- 14) Avoid placing gravel or stone in streams and wetlands as a road bed for construction and inspection traffic.
- 15) Utilize periodic aesthetic bends when traversing forests and at road crossings to limit visibility along the right-of-way.
- 16) Avoid routes which require clearing crests of hills or ridges.
- 17) Replant or leave natural vegetation screens at road, major trail, stream, river, or wetland crossings.
- 18) Institute an active off-road vehicle program.