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

OFFICE: Elko District Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-E000-2011-0503-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 3100

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: March, 2012 Oil & Gas Lease Sale

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: See Attachment 1

APPLICANT: This is a BLM initiated action, based on nominations from industry

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

The BLM, Elko District, proposes to have the State Director offer 77 parcels in the Elko District, totaling approximately 135,975.77 acres for Oil & Gas leasing in the competitive lease sale in March, 2012. A**ttachment 1** contains the parcel list with legal descriptions of the offered parcels and a general location map of the parcels. The parcels would be offered subject to leasing stipulations as identified in the attached table (A**ttachment 2**). The full text of each stipulation is in **Attachment 3**. More detailed map(s) of the parcels are available upon request to the Elko District. The parcels are within areas covered by the 1987 Elko and 1985 Wells Resource Management Plan (RMP), and all are designated as open to leasing. None of the parcels are in or close to a wilderness study area.

As noted in **Attachment 2,** none of the parcels require application of the special recreation management area or developed campground stipulations.

- The stipulations for Threatened, Endangered and Sensitive Species (OG-010-05-01), and Raptor Nesting Sites (OG-010-05-02) would be attached to all leases.
- The stipulation for Cultural Resources/Native American Consultation (OG-010-05-03) also would be attached to all leases. Many of the leases also include notices to advise the potential lessee of the presence of historic roads, trails, structures and/or railroads eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- Special stipulations applicable to some of the proposed lease parcels are for Sage Grouse (Strutting Grounds, Brood Rearing Areas and Crucial Winter Habitat).

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Wells Resource Management Plan **Date Approved** July 1985
LUP Name* Elko Resource Management Plan **Date Approved** March 1987

Other document **(s): December 2005 Lease Sale Decision Record, September 20, 2005**

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The 1985 Record of Decision (ROD) for the Wells RMP, page 25, provides that, "*The public lands will be managed in a manner which recognizes the Nation's needs for domestic sources of minerals*." As a standard operating procedure, the ROD prescribes that, "*Time-of-day and/or time-of-year restrictions will be placed on construction activities associated with leasable and saleable mineral explorations and/or development that are in the immediate vicinity or would cross crucial sage grouse, crucial deer and pronghorn antelope winter habitats, antelope kidding areas, or raptor nesting areas.*"

The 1987 Elko RMP ROD determined lands subject to leasing as follows (Page 35 and Map 13):

(1) Open – subject to standard leasing stipulations

(2) Limited – subject to no surface occupancy (Special Recreation Managements Areas and sage grouse strutting grounds)

(3) Limited – subject to seasonal restrictions.(crucial deer winter range, crucial antelope yearlong habitat and sage grouse brood rearing areas).

(4) Closed – wilderness and wilderness study areas recommended for designation.

The Minerals Objective is to: "*Maintain public lands open for exploration, development and production of mineral resources while mitigating conflicts with wildlife, wild horses, recreation and wilderness resources*."

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.
December 2005 Oil and Gas Lease Sale Environmental Assessment (BLM/EK/PL-2005/005). FONSI/DR signed September 20, 2005

Note: The 2005 EA tiers to the environmental impact statements (EISs) for the 1987 Elko Resource Management Plan and the 1985 Wells Resource Management Plan (RMPs).

List by name and date <u>other documents</u> relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).
See References for the 2005 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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes. This action is similar to the action analyzed in the 2005 EA for the Elko District parcels. Geographic and resource conditions of the currently nominated parcels are similar to the parcels analyzed in the EA. There are no unusual situations that affect leasing of the parcels that would not be mitigated by the stipulations indicated by Attachment 2.

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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes. The analysis of impacts for the Proposed Action in the 2005 EA considered current information on natural, cultural, social and economic resources with respect to leasing activities. One of the alternatives analyzed in the 2005 EA was to defer consideration of nominated parcels for a future sale, pending further study needed before the Elko District could determine measures to best mitigate potential impacts to these resources.

3. **Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland 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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes. Issues and stipulations were identified using the same method used for the 2005 oil & gas leasing EA. Elko District specialists screened the nominated parcels using data available from our Geographic Information System (GIS) in combination with site visits, reports and current information available from other agencies and sources, such as the Nevada Department of Wildlife. This includes consideration of the most recent list of sensitive species. This data was used as rationale to defer 82 of the nominated parcels from leasing due to resource and other concerns. There are no new circumstances or unusual conditions or concerns for the parcels in the Elko District proposed to be offered in the lease sale that would change the analysis and conclusions for the currently proposed leasing action.

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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes. Resource concerns and impacts are substantially the same as those addressed in the 2005 EA, and would be mitigated by the lease stipulations as identified for the new proposed action. The 2005 EA included a reasonably foreseeable development scenario that anticipates expected disturbance and impacts from leasing activities. The analysis continues to apply to the impacts of leasing activities for periodic lease sales.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:
Yes. Preparation of the EISs for the 1985 Wells RMP and 1987 Elko RMP included full participation of the public and a Governor's consistency review. The 2005 EA was prepared based on scoping and review from the public, other agencies and tribes. Coordination with tribes and the Nevada Department of Wildlife on leasing activities is ongoing.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

NAME	TITLE	AGENCY REPRESENTED
Allen Mariluch	Project Lead	BLM
Mark Dean	Hydrologist	BLM
Ryan Howell	Archaeologist	BLM
Nycole Burton	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
Victoria Anne	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the existing 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.

Victoria Anne — 11/9/11

NEPA Coordinator **Date**

_____ _____

Gary Johnson, Deputy State Director, Minerals Management **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.

March 2011 Oil & Gas Lease Sale

Attachment 1

Parcel List with legal descriptions

General Parcel Location Map

Attachment 2

Table 1 – Lease Stipulations per Parcel

Attachment 3

Elko District Lease Stipulations