

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

FIELD OFFICE: Stillwater Field Office, Carson City District

NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2012-0008-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-083931 Geothermal Lease

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TITLE TYPE: ORMAT Dead Horse Wells Geothermal Drilling Permit 24A-6 and 24B-6.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T11N, R33E, Section 6 SWSW

APPLICANT: ORMAT Nevada Inc.

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

ORMAT Nevada Inc. proposes to drill an observation well and an injection well as part of their exploration and development of the geothermal resource potential of the Wild Rose (aka Dead Horse Wells) lease area in Gabbs Valley. The project area which includes the proposed wells is located approximately 26 miles northeast of Hawthorne, Nevada. Access to the site would be along an overland route previously used for drilling well 24-6. ORMAT proposes to improve the existing overland route by constructing an all-weather road across the surface. Vegetation and topsoil would be cleared and saved for later reclamation. A well pad approximately 400 feet by 450 feet would be constructed. The proposed site was analyzed in DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2010-0006-EA.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: **Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan**
Date Approved: May 9, 2001

The proposed action is consistent with the applicable land use plan because it is clearly consistent with the following land use plan decisions, objectives, terms, conditions:

Objective 1: Encourage development of energy and mineral resources in a timely manner to meet national, regional and local needs consistent with the objectives for other public land uses.

Objective 2: Oil, gas, and geothermal exploration and production upon BLM land are conducted through leases with the Bureau and are subject to terms and stipulations to comply with all applicable federal and state laws pertaining to various considerations for sanitation, water quality, wildlife, safety, and reclamation. Stipulations may be site specific and are derived from the environmental analysis process.

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

Carson City District Office – ORMAT Nevada Inc., Environmental Assessment Gabbs Valley and Dead Horse Wells Geothermal Exploration Projects, DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2010-0006-EA

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?

The proposed action is within the project area analyzed in the ORMAT Nevada Inc., Environmental Assessment Gabbs Valley and Dead Horse Wells Geothermal Exploration Projects, DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2010-0006-EA. The proposed area has been culturally cleared.

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

Yes, environmental concerns, interests and resource values have not changed at all since the completion of the 2010 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2010 EA is still appropriate since the environmental constraints of the geothermal exploration have not changed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, range- land health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists 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, the anticipated impacts to the resources have not changed. The proposed site uses an existing access road. The proposed action will not have any adverse effect on the human health or environment.

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, the 2010 EA analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from geothermal development would remain unchanged. The analyzed action is not different from the construction of the proposed well pad and well.

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

Yes, the geothermal resource exploration operations were analyzed in the 2010 EA which describes the public involvement. Consultation with other agencies and interested parties was conducted for that document. The Yomba Shoshone Tribe will be notified via letter of the proposed construction of the well.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Jason Wright <i>ykw</i>	Stillwater Archaeologist	BLM Carson City District

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion

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.

 _____ 10-17-11
Signature of Project Lead

 _____ 10/17/2011
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

 _____
Signature of Responsible Official

Date _____ 11/3/2011

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.