

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-C010-2013-0034-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Oil and Gas Leasing of approximately 960 acres.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Preliminary list of lease parcels

NV-13-09-001 960.000 Acres
T. 0220N., R. 0290E, 21 MDM, NV
Sec. 014 SE;
 024 ALL;
 026 NE.
Churchill County
Stillwater Field Office
Carson City District Office
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

APPLICANT: Stillwater Field Office, CCDO, BLM

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

The Nevada State Office BLM is proposing to offer for leasing, one parcel of 960 acres of public land for oil and gas exploration and development in Churchill County, Nevada on September 10, 2013. Lease issuance alone does not authorize any ground disturbing activities to explore for or develop oil and gas beyond casual use without site-specific approval for the intended operation. Such approval would require a separate site-specific environmental analysis.

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 – Fluid Mineral Leasing within Six Areas on the Carson City District, DOI-BLM-NV-C030-2009-003-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 located approximately six miles north of the project area analyzed in the 2009 EA and is identical to an alternative analyzed therein. The proposed lease area is USBR managed lands as were the parcels analyzed in the 2009 EA and are of similar characteristics of that area.

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 2009 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2009 EA is still appropriate since the environmental constraints of oil and gas leasing 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, and 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 action will not have any adverse effect on the human health or environment. Any changes to lists of sensitive or endangered species would be addressed in a site specific environmental analysis should any future activity be proposed. A team of BLM Stillwater Field Office and USBR resource specialists will convene a field visit to the lease parcel site on May 2, 2013 to further ensure that there would be no new concerns or circumstances for this area.

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 2009 EA analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from oil and gas leasing would remain unchanged from those analyzed in the 2009 EA. A full interdisciplinary team convened field visits to the lease parcel sites over three separate dates; May 23, May 30, and June 6, 2012 – no concerns were identified.

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

Yes, oil and gas leasing was analyzed in the 2009 EA which describes the public involvement. Consultation with other agencies and interested parties was conducted for that document. Letters were sent to Churchill County Commissioners regarding the upcoming lease offerings within their jurisdiction. The Yomba Shoshone and Fallon Paiute Shoshone Tribes will be notified via letter of the proposed leasing action.

This document will be posted on the Agency website for a thirty day public comment period from April 18, 2013 through May 18, 2013 before a decision to lease is made by the agency.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Peter Neugenbauer	Realty Specialist	USBR Lahanton Basin Area
Jason Wright	Archaeologist	BLM Stillwater Field Office
Carla James	Assistant Field Manager	BLM Stillwater Field Office

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.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of 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.