

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-UT-G020-2019-0002-DNA**

November 2018

**Price Field Office March 2019
Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale**

Location:

Green River District
Price Field Office
Emery and Carbon Counties, Utah

Price Field Office
125 S 600 W
Price, Utah 84501
Phone: (435) 636-3600



Worksheet

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

U.S. Department of the Interior
Utah Bureau of Land Management

The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

OFFICE: Price Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G020-2019-0002-DNA

TITLE: Price Field Office March 2019 Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: See Attachment A and Attachment B.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and Any Applicable Mitigation Measures

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Utah State Office, proposes to offer 15 parcels of public land within the Price Field Office for oil and gas leasing in a competitive lease sale to be held in March 2019. The parcels comprise approximately 25,680 acres in Carbon County. All parcels are open for leasing as provided in 43 CFR 3100 and BLM's Competitive Leasing Handbook H-3120-1. Stipulations and lease notices to protect surface and subsurface resources are applicable, as prescribed by the Approved Price Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP). Parcel configuration, stipulations, and lease notices are presented in Attachment A.

If any of the parcels are not leased through competitive bidding, they may be leased non-competitively for two years following the competitive sale. Federal oil and gas leases are issued for a primary term of 10 years, after which the lease would be held indefinitely by paying production.

A lessee's right to explore and drill for oil and gas at some location in the lease is implied by issuance of the lease. The act of leasing does not authorize any development or use of the surface of lease lands without further application by the operator and approval by the BLM. In the future, the BLM may receive Applications for Permit to Drill (APDs) on those parcels that are leased. If APDs are received, the BLM conducts additional site-specific NEPA analysis before deciding whether to approve the APD and what conditions of approval should apply.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Price Field Office RMP

Date Approved: October 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the Price Field Office RMP because it is specifically provided for in the following RMP management goals, objectives, and decisions:

Price Field Office RMP Goal (page 123)

Provide opportunities for mineral exploration and development under the mining and mineral leasing laws subject to legal requirements to protect other resource values.

Price Field Office RMP Goal (page 123)

Support the need for domestic energy resources by managing and conserving the mineral resources without compromising the long-term health and diversity of public lands.

Price Field Office RMP Objective (page 123)

Manage oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development while minimizing impact to other resource values.

Price Field Office RMP Decision MLE-5 (page 125)

The BLM has identified Land Use Plan leasing allocations for all lands within the PFO. In addition, the Proposed RMP describes specific lease stipulations (Appendix R-3) that apply to a variety of different resources including raptors, greater sage-grouse, and big game habitat, as well as program-related Best Management Practices (Appendix R-14) that may be applied on a case-by-case, site-specific basis to prevent, minimize, or mitigate resource impacts (Map R-8).

Price Field Office RMP Decision MLE-9 (page 126)

Oil and gas leasing management will be conducted as shown on Map R-25:

- Areas open to leasing subject to the standard terms and conditions of the lease form (1,161,000 acres)
- Areas open to leasing subject to moderate constraints (timing limitations; CSU, and lease notices) (467,000 acres)
- Areas open to leasing subject to major constraints (NSO) (282,000 acres)
- Areas unavailable to lease (569,000 acres)

The combination of all restrictions on oil and gas development is shown on Map R-26.

C. Identify the applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Listed by name and date are all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action:

- Price Field Office Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (PFO RMP/FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD)
- Price_Richfield Field Offices September 2018 Lease Sale EA DOI-BLM-UT-0000-2018-0001-EA
- Salt Lake Field Office (SLFO) September 2018 Lease Sale EA DOI-BLM-UT-W010-2018-0018-EA
- Price Field Office November 2015 Lease Sale EA DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2015-0031-EA

Listed by name and date are other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report):

- SLFO Wildlife Report for the September 2018 Lease Sale

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is a feature of the selected alternative analyzed in the PFO RMP/FEIS and impacts associated with oil and gas leasing were specifically analyzed in that NEPA document. Based on the ROD for the PFO RMP/FEIS, oil and gas leasing is open, but with a variety of different stipulations and notices as shown in Attachment A.

All 15 parcels under consideration for leasing are located within the analysis area of the PFO RMP/FEIS.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action (or existing proposed action), given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

- Yes

No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The alternatives analyzed in the PFO RMP/FEIS were developed in a highly collaborative, community-based planning process. The BLM developed and analyzed five alternatives, including the No Action Alternative. These alternatives were developed as a result of public and cooperating agency input, which resulted in an adequate range of reasonable alternatives.

The ARMPA/FEIS also had an appropriate range of alternatives analyzed. This NEPA document analyzed four action alternatives, a No Action Alternative, and the Proposed Plan. Each of these alternatives carefully considered oil and gas leasing.

For both of these NEPA documents, the proposed action is a feature of the selected alternative. A BLM Interdisciplinary Team and the public have reviewed the proposed 15 parcels considered for leasing. No significant new information or other change in circumstances in regard to current environmental concerns, interests, or resource values has been identified that would substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. Because no new environmental concerns or resource concerns or resource values have been identified to render previously analyzed alternatives inadequate, the existing range of alternatives is appropriate.

The no action alternative of the RMP EIS was not equivalent to a “No-Leasing” alternative, however the no action alternative of the March 2018 Lease Sale was. The no action alternative allowed for the decision to range from leasing all the proposed parcels to leasing none of them, thus eliminating the need to include alternatives that would remove/defer any specific parcel or parcels.

3. Is existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standards assessment; recent endangered species listings, updated list of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes

No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The PFO RMP/FEIS was approved in 2008. This NEPA document offered adequate analysis for all resources including potential impacts to visual resources resulting from oil and gas leasing throughout the BLM Price Field Office. Changed circumstances/new information since the RMP ROD was signed include Air Quality, Climate Change, Visual Resources, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics and Pollinators. These were analyzed in the Salt Lake and Price/Richfield EAs.

No other new information or circumstances have been presented to the BLM Price Field Office relative to the nominated parcels. The analyses in the existing NEPA documents are adequate.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The PFO RMP/FEIS and ARMPA/FEIS included a comprehensive quantitative and qualitative environmental analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of oil and gas leasing and development. The 15 parcels being considered for leasing are located within the planning area for these NEPA documents; therefore, the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed action were analyzed.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The public involvement and interagency review procedures and findings made throughout the development of the PFO RMP/FEIS and ARMPA/FEIS are adequate for the proposed leasing of parcels nominated for the December 2018 oil and gas lease sale.

The interagency review associated with the development of the PFO RMP/FEIS was extensive. The following agencies/governments participated as cooperating agencies:

- The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- The State of Utah
- Carbon County
- Emery County

Likewise, the interagency review associated with the development of the ARMPA/FEIS was thorough. Every county in the State of Utah was invited to participate as a cooperating agency, and of those, Carbon and Emery Counties (location of the proposed 3 lease parcels) accepted that invitation and had a Memorandum of Understanding signed with the BLM. Other cooperating agencies included:

- The State of Utah
- The State of Wyoming
- United States Forest Service
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)
- United States Department of Defense
- USFWS
- Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Indian Reservation

Several other Native American Tribes and government agencies were invited, but did not accept the invitation to be cooperating agencies.

The appropriate consultations were completed with Native American Tribes, the State Historic Preservation Office and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the USFWS, the EPA, and the United States Department of Defense.

Additionally, during the development of each of the NEPA documents, the BLM followed all other public involvement protocols. The BLM issued news releases at various stages of the process, published Notices of Intent in the Federal Register, held public meetings, published Notices of Availability, released the Draft EISs for public comment, published Notices of Availability of the Final EISs in the Federal Register, and there were also protest periods and consistency reviews that took place.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
William Brant	Archeologist	Native American Consultation Cultural Resources
Myron Jeffs	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Visuals, Wilderness
Jake Palma	Environmental Coordinator	NEPA and Socioeconomics
Stephanie Bauer	Range Management Specialist	Soil, Vegetation, Farmlands
Mike Leschin	Geologist/Paleontology	Paleontology
Mike Tweddell	Range Management Specialist	Wild Horses and Burros
Dana Truman	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Rebecca Anderson	Geologist	Geology and Minerals, Ground Water
Jarred Goodell	Hydrologist	Floodplains, Water Quality
Marc Johnson	Natural Resource Specialist	Reclamation
Stephanie Howard	Environmental Coordinator	Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Stuart Bedke	Fuels Specialist	Fire and fuels Management
Jason Carlile	Range Management Specialist	Livestock Grazing and Rangeland Health

Christine Cimiluca	Botanist	Threatened and Endangered Plants
--------------------	----------	----------------------------------

CONCLUSION *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, then you cannot conclude that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action).*

Plan Conformance:

- This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.
- This proposal does not conform to the applicable land use plan

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

- Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.
- The existing NEPA documentation does not fully cover the proposed action. Additional NEPA documentation is needed if the project is to be further considered.

Signature of Project Lead

Date

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Date

Signature of the Responsible Official

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM’s internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A: Parcel List, Stipulations, and Notices
- Attachment B: Maps
- Attachment C: Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Attachment A – Parcel List, Stipulations, and Notices

UT1218 – 001

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

- Sec. 1: Lots 2, 3, N2SW, SESW, W2SE;
- Sec. 11: N2, N2SW, W2SE, SESE;
- Sec. 12: NW, NWSW, NWSE;
- Sec. 13: SWNW, N2SW, SWSW, NESE, S2SE;
- Sec. 14: N2NE, SWNE, SENW, S2.

1,777.90 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

- UT-S-01: Air Quality
- UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40 percent
- UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
- UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
- UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
- UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural resource inventories
- UT-S-156: TL – High country watershed areas
- UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction surveys)
- UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
- UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
- UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
- UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
- UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
- UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
- UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
- UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
- UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
- UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
- UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
- UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
- UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
- UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices

- T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
- UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
- UT-LN-24: Crucial Moose Habitat
- UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
- UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
- UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 002

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Sec. 3: Lots 1, 2, NESW, S2SW, SE;

Sec. 4: Lots 1, 3, 4, SW, NWSE, SESE;

Sec. 9: N2, SW, N2SE, SWSE;

Sec. 10: W2NW, S2SW, S2SE;

Sec. 15: N2, SW, NWSE.

2,194.93 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality

UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%

UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent

UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams

UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas

UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories

UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)

UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources

UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range

UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range

UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat

UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests

UT-S-285: TL – Bird Nesting

UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed

UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment

UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas

UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap

UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation

UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations

UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure

UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing

UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing

UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin

UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat

UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds

UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes

UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 003

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Secs. 5, 6, 7 and 8: All.

2,160.93 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

- UT-S-01: Air Quality
- UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
- UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
- UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
- UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
- UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
- UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
- UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
- UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
- UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
- UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
- UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
- UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
- UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
- UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
- UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
- UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
- UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
- UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
- UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
- UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
- UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
- UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
- UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

- T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
- UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
- UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
- UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
- UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
- UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 004

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Sec. 17: N2, SW, W2SE, SESE;

Sec. 18: All;

Sec. 19: Lots 1-4, N2NE, E2NW, E2SW, E2SE;

Sec. 20: NENE, S2NE, NW, E2SW, W2SE.
2,125.91 Acres
Carbon County, Utah
Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 005

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM
Sec. 21: W2NE, SENE, NENW, S2NW, SW, E2SE;
Sec. 22: S2NE, NESW, W2SE, SESE;
Sec. 23: W2NE, SENE, N2NW, SENW, N2SW, SESW, SE;
Sec. 24: W2NE, NW, NESW, S2SW, N2SE.

1,680.00 Acres
Carbon County, Utah
Price Field Office

Stipulations:

- UT-S-01: Air Quality
- UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
- UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
- UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
- UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
- UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
- UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys
- UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
- UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
- UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
- UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
- UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
- UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
- UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
- UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
- UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
- UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
- UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
- UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
- UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
- UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
- UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
- UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

- T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
- UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
- UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
- UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
- UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
- UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 006

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Sec. 25: W2NE, SENE, NWNW, S2SW, NESE, S2SE;

Sec. 26: NE, W2NW, W2SW, W2SE, SESE;

Sec. 35: All.

1,605.12 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

- UT-S-01: Air Quality
- UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%

UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-302: NSO – Old Growth Pinon Pine
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 007

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Sec. 27: W2NE, SENE, W2NW, SENW, N2SW, SESW, SE;

Sec. 28: S2NE, NW, NWSW, SESW, NESE;

Sec. 33: SENE, NENW, NESE;

Sec. 34: Lots 1-4, W2NE, SENE, NENW, S2NW, NWSW, N2SE.

1,562.56 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs

UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 008

T. 12 S., R. 8 E., SLM

Sec. 29: NENE, SWNE, NENW, S2NW, N2SW, W2SE;

Sec. 30: NE, E2NW, SESW, N2SE, SWSE;

Sec. 31: Lots 3-6, N2NE, SENE, NENW, NESW.

1,122.21 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 009

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 1: Lots 1-6, N2SW;

Sec. 11: N2, NESW;

Sec. 12: Lots 1, 2, W2NE, NW, NWSE;

Sec. 13: Lots 2-4, W2NE, N2NW, SWNW, NESW, S2SW, W2SE.

1,325.08 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-193: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Lek Sites
UT-S-203: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Nesting and Brooding
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas

UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 010

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 3: Lots 1-4, N2SW, SESW, N2SE, SESE;

Secs. 4 and 9: All;

Sec. 10: N2NE, SENE, NESE.

1,477.24 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-203: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Nesting and Brooding
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range

UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 011

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 5: All excepting RR ROW UTSL034773;

Sec. 6: Lots 1, 3, 5, 6, W2SE;

Sec. 7: Lots 2-4, SENE, E2NW;

Sec. 8: NE, N2NW, S2, excepting RR ROW UTSL034773.

1,396.42 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources

UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 013

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 17: NE, NENW, SWNW, NESW, SWSW, NESE, SWSE, excepting RR ROW
UTSL034773;

Sec. 18: Lots 2, 3, N2NE, NENW, E2SW, SE;

Sec. 19: Lot 3, E2NE, E2SW, SESE;

Sec. 20: NWNE, SENE, NWNW, SENW, SW, S2SE.

1,489.78 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories

UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269 NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 015

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 22: N2, N2SW, SWSW, N2SE, excepting RR ROW UTSL034773;

Secs. 23, 24 and 25: All.

2,337.60 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources

UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
 UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
 UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
 UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
 UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
 UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
 UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
 UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
 UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
 UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
 UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
 UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
 UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
 UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
 UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
 UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
 UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
 UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
 UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
 UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
 UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
 UT-LN-44: Raptors
 UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
 UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
 UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 – 017

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 29: All;

Sec. 30: Lots 1-4, NENE, S2NE, NENW, SESW, SE;

Sec. 31: All.

1,900.64 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
 UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
 UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
 UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
 UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
 UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories

UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-232: TL – Mule Deer and Elk Crucial Winter Range
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269: NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-302: NSO – Old Growth Pinon Pine
UT-S-305: CSU – Noxious Weed
UT-S-343: CSU – Fossil Resource Assessment
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat

Notices:

T&E-03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-03: Crucial Mule Deer and Elk Winter Habitat
UT-LN-52: Noxious Weeds
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

UT1218 –245

T. 12 S., R. 9 E., SLM

Sec. 10: SENW, SW;

Sec. 11: S2SW, SWSE

Sec. 14 N2NE, SENE, S2NW, S2;

Sec. 15; All.

1480.00 Acres

Carbon County, Utah

Price Field Office

Stipulations:

UT-S-01: Air Quality
UT-S-97: NSO – Fragile Soils Slopes greater than 40%
UT-S-101: CSU – Fragile Soils /Slopes 20-40 percent
UT-S-126: NSO – Natural Springs
UT-S-127: NSO – Intermittent and Perennial Streams
UT-S-156: TL – High-Country Watershed Areas
UT-S-169: CSU – Cultural Resource Inventories
UT-S-176: CSU – Fossil Resources (Preconstruction Surveys)
UT-S-177: CSU – Fossil Resources

UT-S-203: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Nesting and Brooding
UT-S-212: TL – Greater Sate-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-248: TL – Mule Deer Fawning and Elk Calving Areas
UT-S-257: TL – Moose Winter Range
UT-S-260: TL – Raptor Habitat
UT-S-269 NSO – Mexican Spotted Owl Nests
UT-S-285: TL – Migratory Bird Nesting
UT-S-347: NSO – Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas
UT-S-348: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Disturbance Cap
UT-S-349: NSO/CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Density Limitation
UT-S-350: CSU/TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding Season Noise Limitations
UT-S-352: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Tall Structure
UT-S-353: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Breeding, Nesting and Early Brood Rearing
UT-S-354: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Brood Rearing
UT-S-355: TL – Greater Sage-Grouse Winter Habitat
UT-S-356: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impacts from Noise
UT-S-357: CSU – Greater Sage-Grouse Indirect Impact from Tall Structures

Notices:

T&E 03: Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin
UT-LN-08: Crucial Elk Calving and Deer Fawning Habitat
UT-LN-60: Steep Slopes
UT-LN-61: Severe Soil Erosion & Steep Slopes

Attachment C – ID Team Checklist

RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)

Project Title: Price Field Office March 2019 Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G020-2019-0002-DNA

Project Leader: Marc Johnson

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: *(Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)*

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NC	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	No emissions would occur from leasing. However, future development would result in emissions that may impact air quality as described in the 2015 and 2018 lease sale EAs for the Price area. Effective August 2018, the EPA has determined that both Carbon and Emery Counties are in attainment of the ozone NAAQS. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient for leasing purposes to disclose potential future impacts to air quality, and the air quality lease stipulation is sufficient to minimize potential future impacts. GHG emissions from future development would occur as described in the 2018 lease sale EA. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient for leasing purposes to disclose potential future impacts from GHG emissions to climate change, and the air quality lease stipulation would be sufficient to minimize potential future impacts.	Stephanie Howard	11/2/18
NC	BLM natural areas	The Price Field Office RMP and GIS map layers were reviewed. There are no natural areas identified in the proposed lease sale area. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NI	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	The sale of a lease does not authorize any surface disturbing activities, including development of specific well pads or other oil and gas facilities. Future undertakings associated with oil and gas development on any leases sold will be analyzed through separate site specific National Environmental Policy Act actions. In accordance with Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations Chapter VIII Part 800, the BLM will not approve any ground disturbing activities that have the potential to cause	William Brant	10/30/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>effects on historic properties until the areas of potential effect have been analyzed and processed according to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and related authorities.</p> <p>The BLM may require modifications to exploration and development proposals to protect historic properties, or disapprove any activity that is likely to result in adverse effect to historic properties that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized, or mitigated.</p>		
NI	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	Tribal consultation letters were sent by certified mail to the appropriate tribal representatives on June 25, 2018. The letters contained a project description, schedule, location maps, and legal descriptions of the offered parcels. The letters requested comments and concerns be submitted by July 25, 2018. The Hopi Tribe responded, requesting a copy of the Class I review and draft EA for comment (Koyiyumptewa, letter correspondence, July 16, 2018). It was also requested the sale be cancelled due to concerns related to a previous oil and gas lease sale in the Moab Field Office. The Utah BLM State Office responded to this request (Roberson, letter correspondence, July 23, 2018).	William Brant	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: National Historic Trails	The Price Field Office RMP and GIS map layers were reviewed. There are no designated historic trails identified in the proposed lease sale area. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	The Price Field Office RMP and GIS map layers were reviewed. There are no designated ACECs identified in the proposed lease sale area. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	The Price Field Office RMP and GIS map layers were reviewed. There are no wild and scenic rivers identified in the proposed lease sale area. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	The Price Field Office RMP and GIS map layers were reviewed. There are no wilderness study areas identified in the proposed lease sale area. The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Environmental Justice	Based on the results of the socioeconomic and environmental impact analysis conducted for the Environmental Impact Statement for the Price Field Office Resource Management Plan, it can be concluded that those persons who reside in and around the PFO would bear some effects from the proposed action; however, any identified socioeconomic or environmental impacts from the proposed	Jake Palma	11/5/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>action would not be localized nor placed primarily on the identified minority and/or low income population components. Therefore, implementation of any of the proposed action would be in compliance with Executive Order 12898. See Section 4.6 of the FEIS for the RMP for more details</p>		
NP	Farmlands (prime/unique)	According to the NRCS soil survey and knowledge of the soils, there are no prime/unique farmlands within the project area.	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18
NC	Fuels/Fire Management	Proposal would not affect any current fire and fuels management activities. Future impacts would be negligible. Follow current fire restrictions	Stuart Bedke	11/5/18
NC	Geology / Minerals / Energy Production	<p>The 2008 RMP FEIS adequately addresses the impacts of oil and gas leasing. Oil and gas exploration could lead to an increased understanding of the geologic setting, as subsurface data obtained through lease operations may become public record. This information promotes an understanding of mineral resources as well as geologic interpretation. Depending on the success of future oil and gas drilling, non-renewable oil and/or natural gas may be extracted from productive wells and delivered to market. Production of oil and/or gas would result in the irretrievable loss of these resources. While conflicts could arise between oil and gas operations and other mineral operations, these could generally be mitigated under the regulations 3101.1-2, where proposed oil and gas operations may be moved up to 200 meters or delayed by 60 days and also under the standard lease terms (Sec. 6) where siting and design of facilities may be modified to protect other resources. There no known locatable, salable or leasable minerals within this block. Again, O&G development can generally be accomplished in concert with multiple land uses.</p>	Rebecca Anderson	10/30/18
NC	Invasive Plants / Noxious Weeds	<p>Surface disturbing activities have the potential to introduce/spread invasive species/noxious weeds. Salt cedar, Russian olive, black henbane, musk thistle, hoary cress, perennial pepperweed, houndstongue, Dyer's woad, Canada thistle, Scotch thistle and Russian knapweed are noxious weeds within the project boundaries. These species are scattered throughout the project areas. Not all species occur in every location, however several of these species occur together. Halogeton, Russian thistle and cheatgrass are invasive species located within the project boundaries. These species are located mainly along roads and two-tracks, fence lines, fire scars and other disturbed areas. Leasing of parcels is an administrative</p>	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		action and will have no effect. Site-specific analysis along with mitigation, BOPs and stipulations addressing above listed invasive species/noxious weeds will occur at the APD stage if these leases are sold.		
NC	Lands/Access	The analysis contained in the Price RMP FEIS adequately addresses the impacts to Lands and Access.	Connie Leschin	10/30/18
NI	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	The proposed sale of the leases is not a surface disturbing activity, and there should be no impact to wilderness characteristics as a result of the lease sale.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Livestock Grazing	<p>Standard operating procedures, best management practices and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as conditions of approval will address livestock grazing resource issues not already analyzed in the Price RMP.</p> <p>Any range improvements such as fences and cattle-guards that would be affected would be replaced or repaired by the applicant. The applicant would replace any barriers to livestock that are removed through field development. AUMs could be lost depending on where development would occur which was anticipated in the RMP vol. 2, 4-230 and 4-241. This could affect four permittees and 8 allotments at the APD stage.</p> <p>Leasing will not have an impact to livestock grazing at this time because no ground disturbance will occur. If development of the leased parcels occur then site specific analysis needs to be completed prior to ground disturbance.</p>	Jason Carlile	10/31/18
NC	Paleontology	Lease parcels 001-017 all have surface exposures of North Horn Formation, a Potential Fossil Yield Classification 4 formation. The RMP adequately describes how to proceed in those circumstances.	Michael Leschin	11/1/18
NC	Plants: BLM Sensitive	<p>Suitable habitat for the following UT BLM Sensitive plant species is present in the proposed lease parcels, per review of BLM special status plant species data, habitat models, and physical / biological characteristics of proposed parcels (geology, soils, elevation, plant communities, etc.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Horse Canyon Stickleaf/ Bookcliffs Blazingstar (<i>Mentzelia multicaulus var. librina</i>) <p>The PFO RMP adequately addresses BLM Sensitive plant species. Lease notice UT-LN-51 Sensitive Plants, would be applied to the following parcels: 001, 003, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 015, 017, and 245.</p>	Dana Truman	11/5/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NC	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	Suitable habitat for threatened, endangered, candidate, or proposed (TECP) plant species may be present in the project area, per review of special status plant data, and habitat models. The PFO RMP adequately addresses listed, proposed, and candidate plant species. The following lease stipulations and /or notices would be applied: T & E 05 – Listed plant species, to all parcels T & E 22 – Ute ladies’-tresses (<i>Spiranthes diluvialis</i>), to all parcels	Dana Truman	11/5/18
NC	Rangeland Health Standards	Water quality, soils, vegetation, Threatened & Endangered Species habitat and other components of ecological conditions that are considered in Rangeland Health Standards and Guides have been analyzed in the Price RMP. Given the degree of anticipated exploration and development and application of standard operating procedures, best management practices and mitigation applied at the APD stage as conditions of approval, it is concluded that Rangeland Health Standards would continue to be met.	Jason Carlile	10/31/18
NI	Recreation	The analysis conducted in the 2008 Price Field Office RMP and associated FEIS is sufficient for this action. Selling the lease to the parcel is not a surface disturbing activity, and therefore would not result in impacts to recreation.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Socio-Economics	The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to socioeconomics from oil and gas leasing was considered in detail in the Environmental Impact Statement for the Price Field Office Resource management Plan throughout Section 4.6 and 4.7. In general, the analysis discuss direct economic benefits from oil and gas development, indirect economic activity from electricity generation, transportation, and other services, resource conflicts, and the quality of life in the surrounding communities resulting from oil and gas development.	Jake Palma	11/5/18
NC	Soils: Physical / Biological	The soils within lease units are currently semi-stable with current vegetation growing. Removing the vegetation will expose the soils and the soils could become unstable. The soils could become unstable due to steep slopes with large precipitation events. Leasing however, will not have any effect on soils as that is an administration action. Other stipulations would be required at the APD stage.	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18
NC	Vegetation	Selling the lease parcels is not a surface disturbing activity, and therefore would not result in impacts to vegetation. The analysis in the 2008 RMP is adequate for the leasing process. A more site-specific analysis will be	Jason Carlile	10/31/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		conducted at the APD stage for the effects on vegetation with the drilling process.		
NC	Visual Resources	See Staff Report.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Wastes (hazardous/solid)	<p>Impacts to resources is not anticipated because of implementing management actions for hazardous materials and waste as identified in the Environmental Impact Statement and the Approved Price Field Office RMP.</p> <p>No impacts on hazardous material and waste as a result of management of other resources, resource uses, or support programs would occur under any alternative because of strict federal regulation of management of hazardous materials, substances, and waste; PFO and national contingency plans; BLM policy on hazardous waste disposal; and continued coordination with federal and State partners regarding hazardous materials and waste issues.</p>	Jake Palma	11/5/18
NC	Water: Groundwater Quality	<p>The lease parcels do not occur within any Sole Source Aquifers or Drinking Water Source Protection Zones (DWSPZs). Compliance with IM UT 2010-055 would be completed prior to APD approval. Maintenance and refueling of equipment could impact water quality. However, standard protocols would minimize possibility of releases. Drill holes will be cased to an elevation below 5800 feet or when groundwater is encountered. No surface disturbance or occupancy would be maintained within 660 feet of any natural springs to protect the water quality of the spring. No new disturbance will be allowed in areas equal to the 100-year floodplain or 100 meters on either side of the center line of any stream, stream reach, or riparian area. At the time of development, drilling operators will conform to the provisions of the operational regulations and Onshore Oil & Gas Order Number 2, which requires the protection and isolation of all useable quality waters. High-country watershed areas would be closed seasonally from December 1 to April 15 to surface disturbing activity at elevations above 7,000 feet.</p> <p>All soils with high erosion potential need care to prevent accelerated erosion that could be transported to streams that are already listed on the 303d list. This will be accomplished by careful placement of drill pads and access routes. Regular maintenance on roads and pads in highly erosive soils will be required.</p>	Rebecca Anderson	10/30/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	Leasing would not, by itself, authorize any ground disturbances which could affect Hydrologic Conditions. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. However, any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance. The before mentioned conditions along with the stipulations applied in the Water: Streams portion of this document keep impacts to this resource negligible, therefore detailed analysis is not required.	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018
NI	Water: Municipal Watershed / Drinking Water Source Protection	Leasing would not, by itself, authorize any ground disturbances which could affect municipal watershed / drinking water source protection zones. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. If development were to occur in these zones a Drinking Water Source Protection Plan would have to be developed and implemented, additionally any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance. These measures will protect this resource, therefore detailed analysis is not required.	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018
NI	Water: Streams, Riparian Wetlands, Floodplains	Leasing would not, by itself, authorize any ground disturbances which could affect these resources. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. However, any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance. The before mentioned conditions along with stipulation UT-S-127 applied to a parcels and UT-S-126 applied to parcels with springs will protect these resources, therefore detailed analysis is not required.	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018
NI	Water: Surface Water Quality	Leasing would not, by itself, authorize any ground disturbances which could contribute runoff affecting surface water quality. Site-specific analysis would be required prior to the approval of any ground disturbance proposal on the leases. The company must adopt a spill prevention plan and storm water control plan to control any potential pollutants from reaching the surface water. Any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance. The before mentioned conditions along with the stipulations and notices applied for floodplain and riparian will protect surface water quality, therefore detailed analysis is not required.		
NI	Water: Water Rights	Leasing by itself would not authorize any project development which could impact water rights. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. However, any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance, therefore detailed analysis is not required.	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018
NI	Water: Waters of the U.S.	The act of leasing will not affect waters of the U.S. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. The company must adopt a SPCC plan and storm water control plan to control any potential constituents from reaching streams. If the company plans on affecting these waters directly, a Stream Alteration Permit would be required, and would also require additional NEPA to look at those changes, as a result detailed analysis is not required at this time.	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018
NP	Wild Horses and Burros	The subject lease parcels are not within any established wild horse or burro herd management area.	Mike Tweddell	11/1/18
NC	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	The effects of leasing, development and the application of the BMPS for raptors was adequately analyzed in the PFO RMP. The application of buffers and timing restrictions identified in the RMP have been effective in mitigating impacts to raptors. Within the parcels proposed for the December lease sale there are known Raptor nests. The stip UT-S-260 would be applied to all parcels.	Dana Truman	11/5/18
NI	Wildlife: Fish (designated or non-designated)	Leasing by itself would not authorize any project development which could impact fish populations. Site-specific effects cannot be analyzed until an exploration or development application is received, after leasing has occurred. However, any development proposal on the leases would be subject to the standard lease terms, and all applicable laws, regulations and onshore orders in existence at the time of lease issuance. The before mentioned conditions along with lease notice T&E-03 on all parcels will protect fish populations. Impacts to habitat and water quality for all fish species are adequately addressed in the Surface Water Quality, and the Steams,	Jerrad Goodell	11-2-2018

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		Riparian, Wetlands, Floodplains sections of this document, therefore detailed analysis is not required.		
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	<p>Many parcels have designated crucial winter range for deer, elk, and moose. The wildlife and botany report gives the specifics for each species.</p> <p>The PFO RMP adequately addresses the effects to crucial winter ranges for wildlife because of drilling activities. The application of the lease notices for winter ranges will allow for site specific adjustments at the APD stage.</p> <p>UT-LN-03 CRUCIAL MULE DEER AND ELK WINTER HABITAT - All except for 009, 010, 245, and 015.</p>	Dana Truman	11/5/18
NC	Wildlife: BLM Sensitive	<p>The Price RMP and ARMPA for sage grouse in 2018 analyzed the effects of leasing and developing oil and gas resources on sage grouse and other sensitive wildlife species. The applications of lease notices and stipulations have been effective in mitigating the site specific concerns at the APD stage. UT-LN-49 (BLM Sensitive Species) has been applied to several parcels . Additional documentation is within the wildlife and botany resources report located in the project files.</p> <p>Most of the Emma Park area has been identified as priority habitat for the Sage Grouse within the Carbon Sage Grouse Management Area. The area provides nesting and brood-rearing habitat as well as winter habitat for sage grouse. Known leks occur nearby. Timing restrictions and buffer distances will be put in place by the application of several stipulations.</p> <p>UT-S-193: NSO leks-All UT-S-203 TL GRSG nesting and brooding.- All UT-S-347 GRSG NSO PHMA-All UT-S-348 GRSG – NSO disturbance cap.- All UT-S-349 – GRSG – density limitation All. UT-S-350 – Noise limitations-All UT-352-GRSG – tall structures-All. UT-S-353 GRSG – TL nesting-All. UT-S-354-GRSG brood rearing-All. UT-S-355 GRSG – winter-All. UT-S-193- NSO GRSG leks-All.</p>	Dana Truman	11/5/18
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	<p>According to the IPaC Accessed on November 5 2018 the following have potential to occur. yellow-billed cuckoo, and Mexican spotted owl. - The Lease parcels do not contain any designated or proposed critical habitat for those species. There are no large wetland or</p>	Dana Truman	11/5/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>riparian areas that could provide suitable nesting habitat for the YBCC within the lease parcels. However, much of the area had been identified as low potential habitat for MSO in habitat models (Lewis). There are no reported occurrences within in the lease parcels of either species. The parcels will have the following stipulations, and notices attached, impacts from development to the wetland and riparian resources would be prevented.</p> <p>UT-S-127 No surface occupancy – intermittent and perennial streams - ALL UT-LN-128 Federal Flood risk management standard- ALL UT-S-269 – No surface occupancy – MSO nests- 002, 05, 06, 010, 011, 013, 015, 017, 245 WO IM-2002-174 endangered species act stipulation. –ALL</p> <p>The RMP analyzed the effects to these species and the implementation of the lease notices and stipulations, no additional effects are expected. Additional documentation is within the wildlife and botany resources report located in the project files.</p>		
NC	Woodlands/Forestry	<p>Several parcels occur within forested areas. Bristle cone pine is also located within several parcels. The proposed action will not result in any impacts because it is an administrative action, however at the APD stage, several acres of woodland/forestry products as well as bristle cone pines could be lost because of the habitat being altered and disturbed.</p>	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date
Environmental Coordinator		
Authorized Officer		