

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

---

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

---

**January 2019**

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

***Location:***

Green River District  
Price Field Office  
Carbon County, 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 C.

### **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)
- Utah Greater Sage-Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (ARMPA/FEIS)
- 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 with 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. All identified new information or other changes in circumstances have been addressed and analyzed in subsequent NEPA documents as identified below in Section D.3.

The EA for the Price Field Office November 2015 lease sale considered the proposed action alternative and the no action alternative. Other alternatives were not considered in detail because the issues identified during scoping did not indicate a need for additional alternatives or mitigation beyond those contained in the Proposed Action.

The EA for the Price and Richfield Field Offices' September 2018 lease sale also considered the proposed action alternative and the no action alternative. Additionally, the following alternatives were considered, but not analyzed in detail:

- Leasing outside of lands identified to have wilderness characteristics. This alternative was not analyzed because it is already considered under the no action alternative.
- Only lease lands with wilderness characteristics that have a non-waivable no surface occupancy stipulations. This alternative would not be in compliance with the Price Field Office RMP, which was developed in anticipation that oil and gas development could potentially impair some lands identified to have wilderness characteristics.
- Phased development leasing. Lessees and operators would first explore and develop lands outside areas identified to have wilderness characteristics. This would put constraints on development leases that do not have constraints according to the current Price Field Office RMP.
- Mitigation leasing, meaning that mitigation measures and best management practices would be applied to each lease, including controlled surface use and no surface occupancy stipulations to protect resources like cultural resources. Many sensitive resources, such as cultural resources, can and are protected through compliance with various legislative Acts, which allow for stipulations derived from outside the RMP process.

The EA for the SLFO September 2018 lease sale considered the proposed action alternative and the no action alternative. No other alternatives to the Proposed Action were identified that would meet the purpose and need of agency action.

**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, Greenhouse Gas, and Visual Resources. These were analyzed in the 2018 SLFO Lease Sale EA, the 2018 Price and Richfield Lease Sale EA, and the November 2015 Price Lease Sale EA.

In light of any new information or changed circumstances, the following three documents contain adequate analysis for air quality and greenhouse gas:

*Price & Richfield Field Offices September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-0000-2018-0001-EA)*

This document discusses emissions from potential development of the proposed parcels in Emery County, Utah, including emission inventories, air quality dispersion modeling, compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), impacts to Air Quality Related Values, particularly in the nearby Class I areas (National Parks and Wilderness Areas), control technologies, well development and well production.

Additionally, this document discloses impacts from greenhouse gases, discussing emissions from potential development and downstream greenhouse gas emissions

*Salt Lake Field Office (SLFO) September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-W010-2018-0018-EA)*

Although the parcels in this particular lease sale document are in Utah County, they are within the same geographic area as the proposed Price Field Office March 2019 lease sale. Similar analysis to that provided in the Price and Richfield Field Offices' September 2018 Lease Sale EA was conducted in this EA, disclosing impacts during development and during production, and offering an emission inventory estimate that demonstrate that there are not likely to be major impacts to air quality or be in violation of the NAAQS.

Additionally, this document discloses impacts from greenhouse gases, discussing emissions from potential development and downstream greenhouse gas emissions

*Price Field Office November 2015 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2015-0031-EA)*

Like the two EAs mentioned above, this document discusses and discloses potential impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions for parcels within Carbon County, Utah.

For a discussion on the adequacy of the RMP's analysis of Visual Resources even in the light of a more recent 2011 Visual Resource Inventory (VRI), see the Visual Resources section of the Interdisciplinary Team Checklist in Attachment C.

**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.

*Price & Richfield Field Offices September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-0000-2018-0001-EA)*

In this document, a thorough impact analysis, including cumulative effects, was conducted to address the following issues:

- Air Quality
- ACEC/Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change
- Lands With Wilderness Characteristics
- Pollinators
- Recreation
- Visual Resources
- Dark Night Sky/Soundscapes

*Salt Lake Field Office (SLFO) September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-W010-2018-0018-EA)*

In this document, a thorough impact analysis, including cumulative effects, was conducted to address the following issues:

- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gases/Climate Change
- Minerals
- Special Status Animal Species
- Wildlife Excluding Special Status Species
- Visual Resources

*Price Field Office November 2015 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2015-0031-EA)*

In this document, a thorough impact analysis, including cumulative effects, was conducted to address the following resource issues:

- Air quality
- Greenhouse gas emissions/climate change
- Cultural resources/Native American religious concerns
- Water quality (drinking/ground)
- Hydrology
- Wetlands/riparian zones
- Soils
- Farmlands (prime or unique)
- Threatened, endangered, candidate or sensitive plants, special status plants
- Non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics
- Old Spanish National Historic Trail
- Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)
- Recreation
- Visual resource management

All potential impacts, including cumulative effects, which might result from leasing the proposed parcels, would be similar to those analyzed in the above-mentioned documents.

**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 March 2019 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.

*Price & Richfield Field Offices September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-0000-2018-0001-EA)*

An external scoping period was conducted by posting the proposed parcel list and maps for a 15-day public comment period from March 30 – April 16, 2018 on BLM’s ePlanning website. Comments were received from:

- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
- State of Utah, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office
- Trout Unlimited
- National Parks Conservation Association
- National Park Service
- Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

The results are summarized in Appendix A of the EA.

*Salt Lake Field Office (SLFO) September 2018 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-W010-2018-0018-EA)*

Section 1.6 Identification of Issues of this EA, describes the public participation process used to identify the issues that are analyzed. The public participation process included a notification posted on the NEPA Register and 30 day review and comment period.

On November 13, 2017, the BLM sent letters to the National Park Service (NPS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), United States Forest Service (USFS) and the State of Utah’s

Public Lands Policy Coordination Office (PLPCO), Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) and the School Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) to notify them of the pending lease sale, solicit comments and concerns on the preliminary parcel list and invite them to participate in site visits. The BLM also provided GIS shapefiles depicting the proposed sale parcels to contact points within the NPS and UDWR. Consultation will also conclude with the State Historic Preservation Office and the Native American Tribes.

The SLFO notified private land owners on December 12, 2017 via certified mail.

The deadline for the public to nominate areas or otherwise submit EOIs was October 2, 2017.

The preliminary EA and the unsigned Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were posted and made available for a 15-day public review and comment period. The document was made available online at the Utah State Office’s Oil and Gas Leasing Webpage and the BLM’s NEPA Register.

BLM received four comment letters from:

- Farmland Reserve, Inc.
- WildEarth Guardinas
- Center for Biological Diversity and Western Watersheds Project
- Trout Unlimited

A summary of the modifications to the EA based on public comments and internal review can be found in section 5.3.1 of the EA. Additionally, responses to all substantive public comments can be found in Appendix E of the EA.

*Price Field Office November 2015 Lease Sale EA (DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2015-0031-EA)*

On June 12, 2015, the public was notified of the proposed action by posting on the Utah BLM Environmental Notification Bulletin Board (ENBB). The process used to involve the public also included a 30-day public review and comment period for the EA and unsigned FONSI from June 12, 2015 to July 13, 2015. In addition to the ENBB, the EA and unsigned FONSI were posted on the BLM Utah’s Oil and Gas Lease Sale webpage.

Comments were received from:

- Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance
- Utah Rock Art Association
- Wildearth Guardians
- State of Utah, Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office

Responses to all substantive comments can be found in Appendix E of the EA document.

**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: Stipulations and Notices

Attachment C: Maps

Attachment D: Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Attachment E: BLM Responses to Public Comments

## **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-56: Drinking Water Source Protection Zone
- 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-56: Drinking Water Source Protection Zone
- 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-56: Drinking Water Source Protection Zone
- 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-56: Drinking Water Source Protection Zone
- 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-56: Drinking Water Source Protection Zone
- 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-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: Lots 2, 3, E2NE, E2SW, SESE;

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

1,533.08 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-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-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 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-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 B – Stipulations and Notice**

**Stipulation Summary Table**

<b>Number</b>	<b>Utah Stipulations</b>
<p><b>Cultural Resources</b> <b>Handbook H-3120-1</b></p>	<p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION</b> This lease may be found to contain historic properties and/or resources protected under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, E.O. 13007, or other statutes and executive orders. The BLM will not approve any ground disturbing activities that may affect any such properties or resources until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the NHPA and other authorities. The BLM may require modification to exploration or development proposals to protect such properties, or disapprove any activity that is likely to result in adverse effects that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized or mitigated.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act</b> <b>Handbook H-3120-1</b></p>	<p><b>THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT</b> The lease area may now or hereafter contain plants, animals or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid BLM-approved activity that would contribute to a need to list such species or their habitat. BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the Endangered Species Act as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq. including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.</p>
<p><b>UT-S-01</b></p>	<p><b>AIR QUALITY</b> All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower shall not emit more than 2 grams of NO<sub>x</sub> per horsepower-hour. <b>Exception:</b> This requirement does not apply to gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower. <b>Modification:</b> None <b>Waiver:</b> None <b>AND</b> All new and replacement internal combustion gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gram of NO<sub>x</sub> per horsepower-hour. <b>Exception:</b> None <b>Modification:</b> None <b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-97</b></p>	<p><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – FRAGILE SOILS/SLOPES GREATER THAN 40 PERCENT</b> No surface occupancy on slopes greater than 40 percent. <b>Exception:</b> If after an environment analysis the authorized officer determines that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives; surface occupancy in the area may be authorized. In addition, a plan from the operator and BLM’s approval of the plan shall be required before construction and maintenance could begin. The plan would have to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An erosion control strategy;</li> <li>• GIS modeling;</li> <li>• Proper survey and design by a certified engineer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Modification:</b> None <b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-101</b></p>	<p><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – FRAGILE SOILS/SLOPES 20-40 PERCENT</b> In surface disturbing proposals regarding construction on slopes of 20 percent to 40 percent, include an approved erosion control strategy and topsoil segregation/restoration plan. Such construction must be properly surveyed and designed by a certified engineer and approved by the BLM prior to project implementation, construction, or maintenance.</p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p><b>Exception:</b> If after an environment analysis the authorized officer determines that it would cause undue or unnecessary degradation to pursue other placement alternatives; surface occupancy in the area may be authorized. In addition, a plan from the operator and BLM’s approval of the plan would be required before construction and maintenance could begin. The plan must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An erosion control strategy;</li> <li>• GIS modeling;</li> <li>• Proper survey and design by a certified engineer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Modification:</b> Modifications also may be granted if a more detailed analysis is conducted and shows that impacts can be mitigated, e.g., Order I soil survey conducted by a qualified soil scientist, finds that surface disturbance activities could occur on slopes between 20 and 40 percent while adequately protecting areas from accelerated erosion.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-126</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – NATURAL SPRINGS</b></p> <p>No surface disturbance or occupancy will be maintained around natural springs to protect the water quality of the spring. The distance would be based on geophysical, riparian, and other factors necessary to protect the water quality of the springs. If these factors cannot be determined, a 660-foot buffer zone would be maintained.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> An exception could be authorized if (a) there are no practical alternatives, (b) impacts could be fully mitigated, or (c) the action is designed to enhance the riparian resources.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-127</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – INTERMITTENT AND PERENNIAL STREAMS</b></p> <p>No new surface disturbance (excluding fence lines) will be allowed in areas within the 100-year floodplain or 100 meters (330 feet) on either side from the centerline, whichever is greater, along all perennial and intermittent streams, streams with perennial reaches, and riparian areas.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officer could authorize an exception if it could be shown that the project as mitigated eliminated the need for the restriction.</p> <p>An exception could be authorized if (a) there are no practical alternatives, (b) impacts could be fully mitigated, or (c) the action is designed to enhance the riparian resources.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-156</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMING LIMITATION – HIGH-COUNTRY WATERSHED AREAS</b></p> <p>High-country watershed areas (above 7,000 feet) will be closed seasonally from <b>December 1 to April 15.</b></p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic conditions if activities would not cause undue damage to soils or roads.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and vegetation conditions.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> Activities may be allowed as long as all surface disturbing activities are conducted before seasonal closure.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-169</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – CULTURAL RESOURCE INVENTORIES</b></p> <p>Cultural resources inventories (including point, area, and linear features) will be required for all federal undertakings that could affect cultural resources or historic properties in areas of both direct and indirect impacts.</p> <p><b>Waiver of Inventory:</b> Although complete Class III inventories will be performed for most land use actions, an authorized officer could waive inventory for any part of an Area of Potential Effect when one or more of the following conditions exist:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Previous natural ground disturbance has modified the surface so extensively that the likelihood of finding cultural properties is negligible. (Note: This is not the same as being able to document that any existing sites may have been affected by surface disturbance; ground disturbance must have been so extensive as to reasonably preclude the location of any such sites.)</li> </ul>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human activity within the last 50 years has created a new land surface to such an extent as to eradicate locatable traces of cultural properties.</li> <li>• Existing Class II or equivalent inventory data are sufficient to indicate that the specific environmental situation did not support human occupation or use to a degree that would make further inventory information useful or meaningful.</li> <li>• Previous inventories must have been conducted according to current professionally acceptable standards.</li> <li>• Records are available and accurate and document the location, methods, and results of the inventory.</li> <li>• Class II “equivalent inventory data” includes an adequate amount of acreage distributed across the same specific environmental situation that is located within the study area.</li> <li>• Inventory at the Class III level has previously been performed, and records documenting the location, methods, and results of the inventory are available. Such inventories must have been conducted according to current professionally acceptable standards.</li> <li>• Natural environmental characteristics (such as recent landslides or rock falls) are unfavorable to the presence of cultural properties.</li> <li>• The nature of the proposed action is such that no impact can be expected on significant cultural resources.</li> <li>• Conditions exist that could endanger the health or safety of personnel, such as the presence of hazardous materials, explosive ordnance, or unstable structures.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-176</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – FOSSIL RESOURCES (PRECONSTRUCTION SURVEYS)</b></p> <p>Preconstruction paleo surveys will be required prior to any surface disturbing activity in the Morrison, Cedar Mountain, Blackhawk, North Horn, or Chinle Formations.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officer may grant an exception if the area has previously been inventoried within the last three (3) years.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-177</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – FOSSIL RESOURCES</b></p> <p>A BLM permitted paleontologist will be required to be onsite during surface disturbance in any Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) 4 or 5 areas.</p> <p><b>Exceptions:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-193</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE LEK SITES</b></p> <p>No surface occupancy within 1/2 mile of Greater Sage-Grouse leks found outside of Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA).</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officer may grant an exception if an environmental analysis demonstrates that the action will not impair the function or utility of the site for current or subsequent reproductive display, including daytime loafing/staging activities, and/or will not result in development of a permanent aboveground structure within 1/2 mile of a lek.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> The authorized officer may modify the NSO area in extent if an environmental analysis finds that a portion of the NSO area is nonessential to site utility or function, or if further analysis shows that the size or location of the lek has changed, or that the proposed action could be conditioned to not impair the function or utility of the site for current or subsequent reproductive display including daytime loafing/staging activities.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> A waiver may be granted if there are no active lek sites and it is determined the sites have been completely abandoned or destroyed or occur outside the initial identified area, as determined by BLM.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-S-203</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMING LIMITATION – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE NESTING AND BROODING</b></p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p>No surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within 2 miles of known Greater Sage-Grouse leks found outside of Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) from March 15 to July 15.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officer may grant an exception if an environmental analysis demonstrates that the action would not impair the function or utility of the habitat for nesting or early brood-rearing activities.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and habitat conditions. Disturbance could occur if the activity were proposed to occur within the buffer, but would occur in non-sagebrush habitat, i.e., the activity could be allowed if it was not in Greater Sage-Grouse habitat and did not in some other way disturb nesting or brood-rearing activity.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> This stipulation may be waived if, in cooperation with UDWR, it is determined that the site has been permanently abandoned or unoccupied for a minimum of 5 years.</p>
UT-S-212	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE WINTER HABITAT</b></p> <p>No surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within Greater Sage-Grouse winter habitat outside of Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) seasonally from <b>December 1 to March 14</b>.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic and/or habitat conditions if certain criteria are met and if activities would not cause undue stress to wintering Greater Sage-Grouse.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and habitat conditions.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> This stipulation may be waived if, in cooperation with the State wildlife agency, it is determined that the site has been permanently abandoned or unoccupied for a minimum of 5 years.</p>
UT-S-232	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – MULE DEER AND ELK CRUCIAL WINTER RANGE</b></p> <p>No surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within mule deer and elk crucial winter range from <b>December 1 to April 15</b>.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic and/or range conditions if certain criteria are met and if activities would not cause undue stress to deer and/or elk populations or habitats.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and range conditions.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> A waiver may be granted if the winter range habitat is unsuitable for or unoccupied during winter months by deer/elk and there is no reasonable likelihood of future winter range use.</p>
UT-S-248	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – MULE DEER FAWNING AND ELK CALVING AREAS</b></p> <p>No surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within mule deer fawning and elk calving areas from <b>May 15 to July 5</b>.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic and/or range conditions if certain criteria are met and if activities would not cause undue stress to deer and elk populations or habitats.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and range conditions.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> A waiver may be granted if the fawning and calving habitat is unsuitable or unoccupied by deer/elk and there is no reasonable likelihood of future use.</p>
UT-S-257	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – MOOSE WINTER RANGE</b></p> <p>No surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within moose winter range from <b>December 1 to April 15</b>.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic and/or range conditions if certain criteria are met and if activities would not cause undue stress to moose populations or habitats.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and range conditions.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> A waiver may be granted if the winter range habitat is unsuitable or unoccupied during winter months by moose and there is no reasonable likelihood of future winter range use.</p>
UT-S-260	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – RAPTOR HABITAT</b></p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p>Raptor nesting complexes and known raptor nest sites will be closed seasonally from <b>February 1 to July 15</b> within ½ mile of occupied nests.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officer may grant an exception if the raptor nest in question is deemed to be inactive by May 31 and if the proposed activity would not result in a permanent structure or facility that would cause the subject nest to become unsuitable for nesting in future years.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and range conditions. Distance may be adjusted if natural features provide adequate visual screening.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> This stipulation may be waived if, in cooperation with the UDWR, it is determined that the site has been permanently abandoned or unoccupied for a minimum of 3 years.</p>
<p><b>UT-S-269</b></p>	<p><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – MEXICAN SPOTTED OWL NESTS</b></p> <p>No surface occupancy within 1/2 mile of known Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO) nests.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The authorized officers may grant an exception if an environmental analysis demonstrates that the action would not impair the function or utility of the site for nesting or other owl-sustaining activities.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> The authorized officers may modify the NSO area in extent if an environmental analysis finds that a portion of the area is nonessential to site utility or function or if natural features provide adequate visual or auditory screening.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> A waiver may be granted if the MSO is de-listed and the area is determined as not necessary for the survival and recovery of the MSO.</p>
<p><b>UT-S-285</b></p>	<p><b>TIMING LIMITATION – MIGRATORY BIRD NESTING</b></p> <p>Migratory bird nesting areas will be closed seasonally from <b>April 15 to August 1</b>. Areas with migratory birds designated as BLM Special Status Species will have the highest priority.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> Upon review and monitoring, the authorized officer may grant exceptions because of climatic and/or habitat conditions if activities would not cause undue stress to migratory bird populations.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Season may be adjusted depending on climatic and range conditions. Distance may be adjusted if natural features provide adequate visual screening.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-305</b></p>	<p><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – NOXIOUS WEED</b></p> <p>Continue implementation of noxious weed and invasive species control actions in accordance with national guidance and local weed management plans, in cooperation with State, federal, affected counties, adjoining private land owners, and other partners or interests directly affected. Implement Standard Operating Procedures and Mitigation Measures for herbicide use as well as prevention measures for noxious and invasive plants identified in the Record of Decision Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States PEIS and associated documents.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-343</b></p>	<p><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – FOSSIL RESOURCE ASSESSMENT</b></p> <p>An assessment of fossil resources would be required on a case-by case basis, mitigating as necessary before and/or during surface disturbance.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The AO may grant an exception if the area has previously been inventoried and an assessment completed.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-347</b></p>	<p><b>NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY - GREATER SAGE-GROUSE PRIORITY HABITAT MANAGEMENT AREAS*</b></p> <p>No surface occupancy within Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA).</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> The Authorized Officer with concurrence with the State Director, may grant an exception only where the proposed action:</p> <p>i. Would not have direct, indirect, or cumulative effects on GRSG or its habitat; OR,</p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p>ii. Is proposed to be undertaken as an alternative to a similar action occurring on a nearby parcel, and would provide a clear conservation gain to GRSG. The conservation gain must include measures, such as enforceable institutional controls and buffers, sufficient to allow the BLM to conclude that such benefits will endure for the duration of the proposed action's impacts.</p> <p>The Authorized Officer may not grant an exception unless the applicable state wildlife agency, the USFWS, and the BLM unanimously find that the proposed action satisfies (i) or (ii). Such finding shall initially be made by a team of one field biologist or other GRSG expert from each respective agency. In the event the initial finding is not unanimous, the finding may be elevated to the appropriate BLM State Director, USFWS State Ecological Services Director, and state wildlife agency head for final resolution. In the event their finding is not unanimous, the exception will not be granted. Approved exceptions will be made publically available at least quarterly.</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None  <b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
<p><b>UT-S-348</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE/NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – DISTURBANCE CAP</b></p> <p>Manage discrete anthropogenic disturbances, whether temporary or permanent, so they cover less than 3 percent on all lands (regardless of land ownership) at each level: 1) PHMA associated with a GRSG population area (referred to as biologically significant units {BSU} when coordinating across state lines) and 2) within the proposed project analysis area to protect PHMA and the life-history needs of GRSG from habitat loss and GRSG populations from disturbance and limit fragmentation in PHMA. This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above (UT-S-347 GRSG) were granted. See Appendix E of the GRSG Approved RMP Amendment for disturbance calculation instructions.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None  <b>Modification:</b> None  <b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
<p><b>UT-S-349</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE/NO SURFACE OCCUPANCY – DENSITY LIMITATION</b></p> <p>Limit the density of energy and mining facilities within Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) during project authorization to an average of one energy/mineral facility per 640 acres on all lands (regardless of land ownership) in PHMA within a proposed project analysis area to protect PHMA and the life-history needs of GRSG from habitat loss and limit fragmentation in PHMA. This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above (UT-S-347 GRSG) were granted. See Appendix E of the GRSG Approved RMP Amendment for calculation details.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None  <b>Modification:</b> None  <b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
<p><b>UT-S-350</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>TIMING LIMITATION/CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – BREEDING SEASON NOISE LIMITATIONS</b></p> <p>Limit noise from discrete anthropogenic disturbances within Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA), including activities from construction, operation and maintenance, to below 10 decibels above ambient sound levels (baseline as available at the signing of the GRSG RMP Amendment ROD or as <u>first</u> measured thereafter) at occupied leks from 2 hours before to 2 hours after official sunrise and sunset during breeding season to protect strutting Greater Sage-Grouse from auditory disturbance associated with development during the breeding season.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p>Limit project related noise in other PHMA habitats and seasons where it would be expected to reduce functionality of habitats that support associated GRSG populations in order to protect GRSG from direct disturbance near leks within PHMA.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> As additional research and information emerges, specific new limitations appropriate to the type of projects being considered would be evaluated and appropriate measures would be implemented where necessary to minimize potential for noise impacts on PHMA GRSG population behavioral cycles.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
<p>UT-S-352</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – TALL STRUCTURES*</b></p> <p>Limit the placement of permanent tall structures** within Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) breeding and nesting habitats to minimize placement of structures that introduction of e new perching and/or nesting opportunities for avian predators.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p> <p>**For the purposes of this restriction, a tall structure is any man-made structure that provides for perching/nesting opportunities for predators (e.g., raptors and ravens) that are naturally absent, or that decreases the use of an area by GRSG. A determination as to whether something is considered a tall structure will be made based on local conditions such as existing vegetation or topography.</p>
<p>UT-S-353</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMING LIMITATION – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE BREEDING, NESTING AND EARLY BROOD REARING*</b></p> <p>Manage uses to prevent disturbance to GRSG populations and habitat by applying seasonal restrictions (e.g., no surface disturbance) between Feb 15 – June 15, in Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) breeding, nesting, and early brood-rearing habitat to seasonally protect those habitats from disruptive activity.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Specific time and distance determinations would be based on site-specific conditions and may be modified due to documented local variations (e.g., higher/lower elevations) or annual climactic fluctuations (e.g., early/late spring, long and/or heavy winter) in order to better protect GRSG, in coordination with the appropriate State of Utah agency.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
<p>UT-S-354</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMING LIMITATION – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE BROOD-REARING</b></p> <p>Manage uses to prevent disturbance to GRSG populations and habitat by applying seasonal restrictions (e.g., no surface disturbance) between April 15 – August 15 in the Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) brood-rearing habitat to seasonally protect that habitat from disruptive activity.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Specific time and distance determinations would be based on site-specific conditions and may be modified due to documented local variations (e.g., higher/lower elevations) or annual climactic fluctuations (e.g., early/late spring, long and/or heavy winter) in order to better protect GRSG, in coordination with the appropriate State of Utah agency.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
<p>UT-S-355</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TIMING LIMITATION – GREATER SAGE-GROUSE</b></p>

Number	Utah Stipulations
	<p align="center"><b>WINTER HABITAT</b></p> <p>Manage uses to prevent disturbance to GRSG populations and habitat by applying seasonal restrictions (e.g., no surface disturbance) between Nov 15 – March 15 in Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA) for Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) winter habitat to protect GRSG within PHMA from disruptive activity during the winter season.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> Specific time and distance determinations would be based on site-specific conditions and may be modified due to documented local variations (e.g., higher/lower elevations) or annual climactic fluctuations (e.g., early/late spring, long and/or heavy winter) in order to better protect GRSG, in coordination with the appropriate State of Utah agency.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>*This would only be applicable to new fluid minerals leases if the exception criteria identified for the NSO stipulation above were granted.</p>
UT-S-356	<p align="center"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – INDIRECT IMPACTS FROM NOISE</b></p> <p>Areas outside of Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA), portions of the State of Utah’s opportunity areas within 4 miles of a lek that is located within PHMA will be subject to the following constraints:</p> <p>Limit noise from discrete anthropogenic disturbances (during construction, operation, or maintenance) so it will not exceed 10 decibels above ambient sound levels (baseline as available at the signing of the GRSG RMP Amendment ROD or as first measured thereafter) at occupied leks within PHMA from 2 hours before to 2 hours after official sunrise and sunset during breeding season (e.g., while males are strutting);</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Limit project related noise in other PHMA habitats and seasons where it would be expected to reduce functionality of habitats that support associated GRSG populations in order to protect GRSG from indirect disturbance near leks within PHMA.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> As additional research and information emerges, specific new limitations appropriate to the type of projects being considered would be evaluated and appropriate measures would be implemented where necessary to minimize potential for noise impacts on PHMA GRSG population behavioral cycles.</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p>
UT-S-357	<p align="center"><b>CONTROLLED SURFACE USE – INDIRECT IMPACTS FROM TALL STRUCTURES</b></p> <p>Areas outside of Priority Habitat Management Areas (PHMA), portions of the State of Utah’s opportunity areas within 4 miles of a lek that is located within PHMA will be subject to the following constraints:</p> <p>Limit the placement of permanent tall structures** adjacent to breeding and nesting habitats to minimize placement of structures that introduce new perching and/or nesting opportunities for avian predators.</p> <p><b>Exception:</b> None</p> <p><b>Modification:</b> None</p> <p><b>Waiver:</b> None</p> <p>**For the purposes of this restriction, a tall structure is any man-made structure that provides for perching/nesting opportunities for predators (e.g., raptors and ravens) that are naturally absent, or that decreases the use of an area by GRSG. A determination as to whether something is considered a tall structure will be made based on local conditions such as existing vegetation or topography.</p>

**Notice Summary Table**

Number	Utah Lease Notices
T&E-03	<p align="center"><b>ENDANGERED FISH OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER DRAINAGE BASIN</b></p> <p>The Lessee/Operator is given notice that the lands in this parcel contain Critical Habitat for the Colorado River fish (bonytail, humpback chub, Colorado pike minnow, and razorback sucker)</p>

Number	Utah Lease Notices
	<p>listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, or these parcels have watersheds that are tributary to designated habitat. Critical habitat was designated for the four endangered Colorado River fishes on March 21, 1994(59 FR 13374-13400). Designated critical habitat for all the endangered fishes includes those portions of the 100-year floodplain that contain primary constituent elements necessary for survival of the species. Avoidance or use restrictions may be placed on portions of the lease. The following avoidance and minimization measures have been designed to ensure activities carried out on the lease are in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Integration of and adherence to these measures will facilitate review and analysis of any submitted permits under the authority of this lease. Following these measures could reduce the scope of Endangered Species Act, Section 7 consultation at the permit stage. Current avoidance and minimization measures include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Surveys will be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All surveys must be conducted by qualified individual(s).</li> <li>2. Lease activities will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project. To ensure desired results are being achieved, minimization measures will be evaluated and, if necessary, Section 7 consultation reinitiated.</li> <li>3. Water production will be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat.</li> <li>4. Avoid loss or disturbance of riparian habitats.</li> <li>5. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable riparian habitat. Ensure that such directional drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers.</li> <li>6. Conduct watershed analysis for leases in designated critical habitat and overlapping major tributaries in order to determine toxicity risk from permanent facilities.</li> <li>7. Implement Appendix B (Hydrologic Considerations for Pipeline Crossing Stream Channels, Technical Note 423).</li> <li>8. Drilling will not occur within 100 year floodplains of rivers or tributaries to rivers that contain listed fish species or critical habitat.</li> <li>9. In areas adjacent to 100-year flood plains, particularly in systems prone to flash floods, analyze the risk for flash floods to impact facilities, and use closed loop drilling, and pipeline burial or suspension according to Appendix B (Hydrologic Considerations for Pipeline Crossing Stream Channels, Technical Note 423, to minimize the potential for equipment damage and resulting leaks or spills.</li> </ol> <p>Water depletions from <i>any</i> portion of the Upper Colorado River drainage basin above Lake Powell are considered to adversely affect or adversely modify the critical habitat of the four resident endangered fish species, and must be evaluated with regard to the criteria described in the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Formal consultation with USFWS is required for all depletions. All depletion amounts must be reported to BLM.</p> <p>Additional measures to avoid or minimize effects to the species may be developed and implemented in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service between the lease sale stage and lease development stage to ensure continued compliance with the ESA.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-LN-03</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CRUCIAL MULE DEER AND ELK WINTER HABITAT</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that the area has been identified as containing crucial mule deer and elk winter habitat. Exploration, drilling and other development activities may be restricted from December 1 through April 15. Modifications including seasonal restrictions may be required to the Surface Use Plan of Operations in order to protect the winter habitat. This limitation does not apply to operation and maintenance of producing wells.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-LN-08</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CRUCIAL ELK CALVING AND DEER FAWNING HABITAT</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that lands in this lease have been identified as containing crucial elk calving or deer fawning habitat. Exploration, drilling and other development activities may be restricted from May 15 through July 5 to protect calving / fawning. Modifications may be required in the Surface Use Plan of Operations including seasonal timing restrictions to protect the species and its habitat.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>UT-LN-24</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CRUCIAL MOOSE HABITAT</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that the area has been identified as containing crucial moose habitat. Exploration, drilling and other development activities may be restricted from</p>

<b>Number</b>	<b>Utah Lease Notices</b>
	December 1 through April 15 to protect crucial moose winter range. Modifications, including seasonal/timing restrictions, may be required in the Surface Use Plan of Operations to protect moose habitat.
<b>UT-LN-44</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RAPTORS</b></p> <p>Appropriate seasonal and spatial buffers shall be placed on all known raptor nests in accordance with Utah Field Office Guidelines for Raptor Protection from Human and Land use Disturbances (USFWS 2002) and Best Management Practices for Raptors and their Associated Habitats in Utah (BLM 2006). All construction related activities will not occur within these buffers if pre-construction monitoring indicates the nests are active, unless a site-specific evaluation for active nests is completed prior to construction and if a BLM wildlife biologist, in consultation with USFWS and UDWR, recommends that activities may be permitted within the buffer. The BLM will coordinate with the USFWS and UDWR and have a recommendation within 3-5 days of notification. Any construction activities authorized within a protective (spatial and seasonal) buffer for raptors will require an on-site monitor. Any indication that activities are adversely affecting the raptor and/or its' young the on-site monitor will suspend activities and contact the BLM Authorized Officer immediately. Construction may occur within the buffers of inactive nests. Construction activities may commence once monitoring of the active nest site determines that fledglings have left the nest and are no longer dependent on the nest site. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in accordance with section 6 of the lease terms and 43CFR3101.1-2.</p>
<b>UT-LN-52</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>NOXIOUS WEEDS</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that lands in this lease have been identified as containing or is near areas containing noxious weeds. Best management practices to prevent or control noxious weeds may be required for operations on the lease.</p>
<b>UT-LN-56</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>DRINKING WATER SOURCE PROTECTION ZONE</b></p> <p>This lease (or a portion thereof) is within a public Drinking Water Source Protection zone. Before application for a permit to drill (APD) submittal or any proposed surface-disturbing activity, the lessee/operator must contact the public water system manager to determine any zoning ordinances, best management or pollution prevention measures, or physical controls that may be required within the protection zones. Drinking Water Source Protection plans are developed by the public water systems under the requirements of R309-600. Drinking Water Source Protection for Ground-Water Sources. (Utah Administrative Code). There may also be county ordinances in place to protect the source protection zones, as required by Section 19-4-113 of the Utah Code.</p> <p>Incorporated cities and towns may also protect their drinking water sources using Section 10-8-15 of the Utah Code. This part of the Code gives cities and towns the extraterritorial authority to enact ordinances to protect a source of drinking water ... "For 15 miles above the point from which it is taken and for a distance of 300 feet on each side of such stream..." Class I cities (greater than 100,000 population) are granted authority to protect their entire watersheds.</p> <p>Some public water sources qualify for monitoring waivers which reduce their monitoring requirements for pesticides and volatile organic chemicals (VOCs). Exploration, drilling, and production activities within Source Protection zone 3 could jeopardize these waivers, thus requiring increased monitoring. Contact the public water system to determine what effect your activities may have on their monitoring waivers. Please be aware of other State rules to protect surface and ground water: the Utah Division of Water Quality Rules R317 Water Quality Rules; and Rules of the Utah Division of Oil, Gas and Mining, Utah Oil and Gas Conservation Rules R649.</p> <p>At the time of development, drilling operators will additionally conform to the operational regulations in Onshore Oil &amp; Gas Order No. 2 (which requires the protection and isolation of all usable quality waters, ≤ 10,000 mg/L Total Dissolved Solids), Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7 (which prescribes measures required for the handling of produced water to insure the protection of surface and ground water sources) and the Surface Operating Standards and Guidelines for Oil and Gas Development, The Gold Book, Fourth Edition-Revised 2007 (which provides information and requirements for conducting environmentally responsible oil and gas operations).</p> <p>Additional mitigation measures may be necessary to prevent adverse impacts from oil and gas exploration and development activities. Mitigation measures may include submitting an erosion control plan with best management practices (BMPs) that address rigorous interim reclamation</p>

<b>Number</b>	<b>Utah Lease Notices</b>
	<p>which might include surface roughening, vegetative buffer strips, etc.; and sediment control through the use of sediment logs, silt fences, erosion control blankets, outlet/inlet protection of water control features such as culverts or diversion ditches, sediment traps, run on/run off pad design features. If project activities are close to sensitive areas or water sources a semi or closed-loop drilling system should be required.</p>
<b>UT-LN-60</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>STEEP SLOPES</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that this lease has been identified as containing steep slopes. No surface use or otherwise disruptive activity allowed on slopes in excess of 30 percent without written permission from the Authorized Officer. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in accordance with section 6 of the lease terms and 43CFR3101.1-2.</p>
<b>UT-LN-61</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SEVERE SOIL EROSION &amp; STEEP SLOPES</b></p> <p>The lessee/operator is given notice that the lands in this lease have been identified as having critical to severe soil erosion conditions and slopes exceeding 40%. The authorized officer may prohibit surface disturbing activities during wet and muddy periods to minimize watershed damage. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may also be required. This limitation does not apply to operation and maintenance of producing wells.</p>



## Attachment D – 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 because the leasing of parcels is an administrative action and does not result in any surface disturbing activity or development. 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
NC	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.	William Brant Nate Thomas	10/30/18 1/23/19

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>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 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> <p>Update: Parcels involved in the March 2019 lease sale were analyzed individually within each field office. Previously recorded sites (including eligible and not eligible cultural resources) within the APE of each parcel were identified by using the Utah Division of State History geodatabase, General Land Office maps, and Field Office records. Records were used to determine site type, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility status, and whether there were any potentially sensitive sites or site components.</p> <p>Using these data, the areas within each parcel and within a half mile buffer of a parcel were analyzed to determine whether reasonably foreseeable development could occur somewhere within the parcel without adverse effects to historic properties. Historic properties within the APE were analyzed for potential direct effects, and in certain cases indirect, and cumulative effects caused by a single well pad within parcel boundaries; the analysis uses the appropriate expected surface disturbance for a single well pad and associated access as defined above.</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	William Brant Nate Thomas	10/30/18 1/23/19

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		(Roberson, letter correspondence, July 23, 2018).  Update: Tribal consultation is ongoing. In response to the Hopi Tribe's request, the cultural resource report was emailed to the Hopi Tribe and many other Tribes in the region on January 17, 2019.		
NC	Designated Areas: National Historic Trails	The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient because no designated historic trails cross any of the proposed lease sale parcels.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient because no ACECs cross any of the proposed lease sale parcels.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient because no Wild and Scenic Rivers cross any of the proposed lease sale parcels.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	The existing NEPA analysis is sufficient because no WSAs cross any of the proposed lease sale parcels.	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18
NC	Environmental Justice	Based on the results of the socioeconomic and environmental impact analysis conducted for the PFO RMP FEIS (Sec. 4.6), 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 action would not be localized or placed primarily on the identified minority and/or low income members of the population. Therefore, implementation of any of the proposed action would be in compliance with Executive Order 12898 and does not warrant further NEPA analysis.	Jake Palma	11/5/18
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	The proposed lease sale will not affect any current fire and fuels management activities and any future impacts will be negligible if the current fire restrictions are maintained.	Stuart Bedke	11/5/18
NC	Geology / Minerals / Energy Production	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,	Rebecca Anderson	10/30/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>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 are no known locatable, salable or leasable minerals within this block. Again, O&amp;G development can generally be accomplished in concert with multiple land uses.</p>		
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 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.</p>	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18
NC	Lands/Access	<p>The analysis contained in the Price RMP FEIS adequately addresses the impacts to Lands and Access.</p>	Connie Leschin	10/30/18
NI	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	<p>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.</p>	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>	Jason Carlile	10/31/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		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.		
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	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.): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Horse Canyon Stickleaf/ Bookcliffs Blazingstar (<i>Mentzelia multicaulus var. librina</i>)</li> </ul> <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
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
NC	Recreation	The impacts to recreation resulting from oil and gas development are disclosed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Price Field Office Resource Management Plan starting on page 4-269. Cumulative impacts are disclosed on page 4-450 of the same document.	Jake Palma	1/17/2019

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>The FEIS discusses intrusions to and loss of scenic quality, conflicts between mineral development and recreational uses, recreation user displacement, etc.</p> <p>On page 4-458 of the FEIS, the irretrievable commitment of resources resulting from oil and gas well pads is discussed, including the impacts they will have on visual resource management, which is a component of recreation resource management.</p> <p>Additionally, on page 4-459 of the FEIS, the unavoidable adverse impacts of oil and gas development are discussed in relation to its impact to recreation.</p> <p>The location of these lease parcels is within an Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), meaning the recreation is non-specialized, dispersed, does not require intensive management, and is generally not the primary management objective of the area. There are no special management prescriptions within an ERMA, but is managed according to the overlying management prescriptions in the RMP.</p>		
NC	Socio-Economics	<p>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.</p>	Jake Palma	11/5/18
NC	Soils: Physical / Biological	<p>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.</p>	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18
NC	Vegetation	<p>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 conducted at the APD stage for the effects on vegetation with the drilling process.</p>	Jason Carlile	10/31/18
NC	Visual Resources	<p>The parcels, or portions thereof, that are on BLM are comprised of roughly 20% VRM</p>	Myron Jeffs	10/30/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>III and 80% VRM IV. The management objective for class III is to partially retain the existing character of the landscape, where the level of change to the landscape should be moderate. For class IV, the objective is to provide for management activities that may require major modification of the existing character of the landscape.</p> <p>The parcels are located within Scenic Quality Rating Units 3, 3A, 4, and 4A. The narratives of those units describe the area as "...numerous finger ridges and drainages that flow ... to the Price River canyon. Landforms are generally large but gently sloping with steeper slopes in drainages and river canyon (p. A4). Vegetation is predominantly sage with stands of aspen, evergreens, maples, and oak on slopes and in drainages (p. A5). This unit includes sage and agriculture in a bench area that transitions between formations in the Book Cliffs. Some agriculture use adds to the setting. Some small areas of aspen extend down the hills..." (p. A159). The ratings for these units varied from a score of 12 to 19. These scores result in the majority of the parcels receiving a B quality scenery rating, while a small portion near Highway 6 and the county line received a quality rating of A. The units received high scores for landform, color, and adjacent scenery. Based solely on these scenic values, the 2011 VRI identified the BLM portions of these parcels as roughly 90% inventory class II and 10% inventory class III. These inventory classes are for informational purposes, and identified prior to management consideration of other resource uses and allocations.</p>		
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

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NC	Water: Groundwater Quality	<p>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 &amp; 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
NI	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	<p>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.</p>	Jerrad Goodell	11/2/2018
NI	Water: Municipal Watershed / Drinking Water Source Protection	<p>Leasing would not, by itself, authorize any ground disturbances which could affect municipal watershed / drinking water source protection zones. 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</p>	Jerrad Goodell	11/2/2018

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		issuance, as well as a lease notice specific to address protection of these resources. These measures will protect this resource, therefore detailed analysis is not required.		
NI	Water: Steams, 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 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.	Jerrad Goodell	11/2/2018
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	Jerrad Goodell	11/2/2018

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		changes, as a result detailed analysis is not required at this time.		
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, Riparian, Wetlands, Floodplains sections of this document, therefore detailed analysis is not required.	Jerrad Goodell	11/2/2018
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	Many parcels have designated crucial winter range for deer, elk, and moose. The wildlife and botany report gives the specifics for each species.  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. UT-LN-03 CRUCIAL MULE DEER AND ELK WINTER HABITAT - All except for 009, 010, 245, and 015.	Dana Truman	11/5/18
NC	Wildlife: BLM Sensitive	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	Dana Truman	11/5/18

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		<p>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. Parcels 009, 010, 011, 015, 245 are located within the general Emma Park 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>		
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	<p>According to the IPaC Accessed on November 5 2018 the following have potential to occur.</p> <p>yellow-billed cuckoo, and Mexican spotted owl. -</p> <p>The Lease parcels do not contain any designated or proposed critical habitat for those species. There are no large wetland or 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.</p>	Dana Truman	11/5/18

<b>Determination</b>	<b>Resource/Issue</b>	<b>Rationale for Determination</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
		Additional documentation is within the wildlife and botany resources report located in the project files.		
NC	Woodlands/Forestry	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.	Stephanie Bauer	11/5/18

FINAL REVIEW:

<b>Reviewer Title</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date</b>
Environmental Coordinator		
Authorized Officer		

**Attachment E – BLM Responses to Public Comments**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Comment Topic</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>BLM Response</b>
1	Western Energy Alliance	Sage Grouse Stipulations	<p>The Alliance does, however, recommend BLM provide some flexibility regarding the GrSG stipulations as it proceeds to the leasing stage...</p> <p>Because BLM has proposed to modify these stipulations, the Alliance disagrees with BLM’s decision to offer parcels for lease with stipulations from the 2015 RMP Amendments that BLM has proposed to change. Oil and natural gas lessees should not be required to adhere to lease stipulations that BLM determines are not warranted or should be modified.</p>	<p>It is BLM policy that existing land use plan decisions remain in effect until an amendment or revision is complete and approved (see IM-2018-034 {Updating Oil and Gas Leasing Reform – Land Use Planning and Lease Parcel Reviews} – Policy/Action Section I.A.). In addition, as noted in BLM Handbook 1624 (Planning for Fluid Mineral Resources), “all circumstances for granting a waiver, exception, or modification [to a stipulation] must be documented in the plan or plan amendment” (Chapter IV, C.3). The BLM has applied to the various lease parcels the pertinent stipulations identified in the existing resource management plans, as amended by the 2015 RMP amendments for Greater Sage-Grouse, with the corresponding waivers, modifications, and exceptions.</p>
2	Western Energy Alliance	Sage Grouse Stipulations	<p>To avoid subjecting oil and natural gas lessees to out-of-date and superseded lease stipulations, the Alliance requests that BLM include a provision in the GrSG lease stipulations attached to parcels</p>	<p>See response to comment #1.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			<p>offered at the March 2019 lease sale that allows the lessee to elect to adhere to the lease stipulation set forth in the RMP (1) in effect at the time the lease sale is held, (2) in effect at the time the lease is issued, or (3) in effect at the time of development. Specifically, the Alliance requests that the GrSG lease stipulations include the following language:  <i>In lieu of adhering to the lease stipulation set forth above, the lessee may elect to implement the applicable stipulation under the Resource Management Plan in effect either (1) at the time the lease sale is held; (2) at the time the lease is issued; or (3) at the time BLM approves an Application for Permit to Drill a well on the lease.</i></p>	
3	Public Lands Policy Coordinating Office	Drinking Water	<p>The State supports the lease sale of all parcels within the Price Field Office, but requests that the BLM exercise caution for parcels located within the Fish Creek Spring Drinking Water Source Protection Zone for Helper City, Utah, and the Upper Colton Spring Drinking Water Source Protection Zone for Price Municipal Corporation (please see Map #1 included below, provided by the Utah Department</p>	<p>As stated in the Interdisciplinary Team Checklist for this project, 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.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			<p>of Environmental Quality). Proposed parcels where future oil and gas development could have some impact on drinking water sources with these two Drinking Water Source Protection Zones include UT1218-001, UT1218-002, UT1218-003, UT1218-004, and UT1218-005. Nonetheless, the State supports the lease sale of these parcels in conjunction with responsible protection of drinking water sources.</p>	<p>Finally, a lease notice notifying potential lease buyers of the need for protective measures has been applied to the parcels in these areas. These measures will protect drinking water resources.</p>
4	Public Lands Solutions	Impacts to Recreation	<p>We believe that the BLM has not adequately analyzed the potential impacts of this proposed lease sale on specific recreation assets. Because the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of this lease sale could be detrimental to recreation and the local communities that have invested in recreation assets, the BLM should fully evaluate the cumulative impacts of this competitive lease sale on the region's recreation economy and how it would impact future growth opportunities in the local business community and socioeconomics regionally. We urge the</p>	<p>This comment is not specific to the proposed action considered in the Price Field Office DNA. In order for the BLM to consider this comment, the commenter should specifically identify specific recreation assets. That being said, the impacts to recreation resulting from development of oil and gas leases are disclosed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Price Field Office Resource Management Plan starting on page 4-269. Cumulative impacts are disclosed on page 4-450 of the same document.</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			BLM to defer these leases until it conducts a hard look environmental analysis and proposes leasing stipulations or other measures to minimize/mitigate oil and gas development impacts on recreation assets and associated socioeconomics.	
5	Public Lands Solutions	Hard Look	<p>Through these lease sale Environmental Analyses (EAs) and Determinations of NEPA Adequacy (DNAs), the BLM has failed to take the required “hard look” at potential environmental impacts on recreation from oil and gas leasing.</p> <p>The Price DNA states that the proposed action is in conformance with the Price Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP), which has a goal to “manage oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development while minimizing impact to other resource values.” However, the Price DNA provides no stipulations or management considerations to mitigate impacts to recreation because “selling the lease to the parcel is not a surface disturbing activity, and therefore would not result in impacts to recreation.” The</p>	<p>See response to comment #4.</p> <p>The FEIS discusses intrusions to and loss of scenic quality, conflicts between mineral development and recreational uses, recreation user displacement, etc.</p> <p>BLM Resource Specialists conducted parcel-specific reviews for the March sale and determined that the impacts to recreation are within the scope of the analysis in the RMP FEIS.</p> <p>The Interdisciplinary Team Checklist for Recreation has been updated.</p> <p>On page 4-435 of the FEIS for the Approved Price Field Office RMP, the socioeconomic impacts to recreation resulting from oil and gas development are discussed:</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			<p>Price DNA states further that the “direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to socioeconomics from oil and gas leasing was considered in detail” in the Price RMP and therefore this DNA need not look at those considerations. However, the Price RMP’s analysis primarily discussed direct economic benefits from oil and gas development, not potentially negative impacts from oil and gas development on other uses that generate economic benefits such as recreation.</p>	<p>“Some recreationists would continue to be affected by continued development of gas resources. However, these impacts are expected to vary across the PFO. Surface disturbances might continue in some high-value recreation areas, with somewhat more of the area open to leasing with standard terms and conditions and somewhat less subject to minor and major constraints. Gas development in open areas could reduce the quality of recreational experiences, displace recreational users to other less developed areas, or eliminate some uses altogether for some users. Recreational experiences are expected to be maintained in the no-lease areas, which would preserve the natural character of landscapes and maintain existing recreational opportunities.”</p>
6	Public Lands Solutions	Stipulations and Best Management Practices	<p>The Price RMP did not adequately analyze how oil and gas developments might affect recreation activity and related socioeconomics, nor did it consider mitigating measures to protect recreation and related socioeconomics in</p>	<p>See response to comments #4 and #5.</p> <p>On page 4-458 of the FEIS, the irretrievable commitment of resources resulting from oil and gas well pads is discussed, including the impacts they will have on visual</p>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			<p>any significant detail. The RMP does impose stipulations to mitigate impacts to a range of values and resource considerations, but recreation and related socioeconomics are not among them. The RMP (at 2) does state that “there may be a need to evaluate management prescriptions and resource allocations to address the increases in recreation and visitor use, including scenic quality and open spaces, as well as the increased interest in oil and gas development.” Because none of the RMP’s Best Management Practices for oil and gas leasing (“state-of-the-art mitigation measures applied on a site-specific basis to reduce, prevent, or avoid adverse environmental or social impacts”) relate to recreation assets and associated socioeconomics, the Price DNA is inadequate and the BLM should conduct a more appropriate analysis considering how this leasing proposal might impact recreation.</p>	<p>resource management, which is a component of recreation resource management.</p> <p>Additionally, on page 4-459 of the FEIS, the unavoidable adverse impacts of oil and gas development are discussed in relation to its impact to recreation.</p>
7	Public Lands Solutions	Cumulative Impacts and	These EAs and DNAs acknowledge foreseeable impacts but neglect to consider how these lease sales might	This comment is not specific to the proposed action considered in the Price Field Office DNA. In order for the BLM to

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
		Mitigation Measures	cumulatively impact recreation assets and related socioeconomics, nor do they propose any mitigating measures to address such negative impacts.	consider this comment, the commenter should identify specific recreation assets. See responses to comments #4, #5, and #6.
8	Public Lands Solutions	New Stipulations	<p>The BLM’s multiple-use mandate prohibits the management of public lands primarily for energy development or in a manner that unduly or unnecessarily degrades other “co-equal” uses such as “outdoor recreation, fish and wildlife, grazing, and rights-of-way must receive the same consideration as energy development.” 43 U.S.C. § 1732(a), 43 U.S.C. § 1702(l). Therefore, we urge the BLM to develop a more considerate set of EAs for this statewide lease sale that either defers these leases or implements the following standards for protecting recreation assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSO stipulation for a 1-mile radius from developed recreation site boundaries. NSO stipulation within 0.5 miles of the centerline of high use routes (motorized) and trails (non-motorized).</li> </ul>	This comment is not specific to the Price DNA. In order for the BLM to consider this comment, the commenter should specifically identify which issue applies to each proposed action. The existing stipulations for oil and gas leasing were developed as part of a thorough and public land use planning process for the Approved Price Field Office RMP (2008). Developing new NSO or CSU stipulations would require a RMP amendment and is outside the scope of this project.

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NSO stipulation for a 0.5-mile radius around high use recreation areas.</li> <li>• NSO stipulation to all VRM Class II areas in Special Recreation Management Areas and a Baseline CSU stipulation throughout the remainder of SRMAs.</li> <li>• Apply an NSO stipulation to Recreation Focus Areas</li> </ul>	
9	National Wildlife Federation	Various	Various	<p>The BLM National Environmental Handbook (H-1790-1) states that substantive comments do one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question, with reasonable basis the accuracy of information in the EIA or EA</li> <li>• Question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of methodology for, or assumptions used for the environmental analysis</li> <li>• Present new information relevant to the analysis</li> </ul>

Comment #	Commenter	Comment Topic	Comment	BLM Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present reasonable alternatives other than those analyzed in the EIS or EA</li> <li>• Cause changes or revisions in one or more of the alternatives.</li> </ul> <p>National Wildlife Federation's comment letter is too broad and non-specific to be considered substantive. The BLM is under no obligation to sort through a comment letter for multiple documents and try to determine which comments would apply to which document. No responses to the comments in this letter are being provided.</p>