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

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0215-DNA

August 4, 2014

Crescent Point Energy US Corp.
Randlett 3D Seismic

Location: **Uintah County, Utah**
Sections 26, 27, & 35; Township 6 South, Range 19 East, SLM
Sections 1, & 12; Township 7 South, Range 19 East, SLM
Sections 19, 29, 30, & 31; Township 7 South, Range 20 East, SLM
Sections 5, 8, 9, & 17; Township 8 South, Range20 East, SLM

Applicant/Address: **Crescent Point Energy US Corp.**
555 17th Street, Suite 750
Denver, CO 80202

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Vernal Field Office
170 S 500 E
Vernal, UT 84078
Phone: 435-781-4400
Fax: 435-781-4410

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: Vernal Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0215-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: Not Applicable

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Crescent Point Energy US Corp. Randlett 3D Seismic

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Uintah County, Utah
Sections 26, 27, & 35; Township 6 South, Range 19 East, SLM
Sections 1, & 12; Township 7 South, Range 19 East, SLM
Sections 19, 29, 30, & 31; Township 7 South, Range 20 East, SLM
Sections 5, 8, 9, & 17; Township 8 South, Range20 East, SLM

APPLICANT (if any): Crescent Point Energy US Corp.

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

Crescent Point Energy proposes to conduct a 3D seismic geophysical survey for approximately 90,368 acres of land in Duchesne and Uintah Counties in northeastern Utah. The BLM, Vernal Field Office administers 2,079 acres of this survey area. As part of the seismic survey, Crescent Point would generate sonic energy through Vibroseis or dynamite shothole technology. Energy source points, which are sites along source lines where either Vibroseis vehicles or dynamite shotholes would be located, would be oriented in lines positioned in an east-to-west array, perpendicular to the receiver arrays. The source points would be spaced at an interval of 186.7 feet with a line separation of about 1,320 feet, for a total of 22,671 energy source points (approximately160 points per square mile). The exact number of Vibroseis or dynamite shothole energy source would be determined once the source point civil survey phase of the project has been completed; however, Crescent Point's preferred method is Vibroseis. Data receivers would be oriented in lines in a north-to-south

array. The data receivers, comprising a string of six geophone sensors, would be spaced at an interval of about 132 feet with a line separation of 792 feet, for a total of 37,690 data receiver points (approximately 268 points per square mile). Of these 37,690 receiver points, a total of 22 lines of 180 receivers (approximately 3,960 points) would be active for the actual recording of each individual source point. No new access roads or workspaces would be constructed.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance:
LUP Name:

Vernal Resource Management Plan Record of Decision (VRMP/ROD), approved October 31, 2008.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision (objectives, terms, and conditions): Management Decision MIN-8;

MIN-8
The Approved RMP will provide for a variety of oil and gas operations and geophysical explorations. These activities will be allowed in the VPA unless precluded by other program prescriptions. The stipulations identified for surface-disturbing activities in Appendix K will generally apply to these activities.

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

- Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120; July, 2014

  Crescent Point Energy U.S. Corp.'s
  3D Seismic Geophysical Survey
  Environmental Assessment

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

- Biological Opinion for above referenced Environmental Assessment

  Conclusion of formal section 7 consultation for Crescent Point Energy U.S. Corp's. Proposed Randlett 3D Seismic Survey; June 3, 2014

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?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action is a feature of Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120; July, 2014.

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?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

There have been no new environmental concerns developed after the original NEPA document was signed. The proposed project lies within the area that was analyzed in the original NEPA document.

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?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

There have been no information come to light or circumstances that would make existing analysis inadequate.

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?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Because the project would fall within the area analyzed in NEPA document Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120; July, 2014 there are no new direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the proposed action.

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

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

No additional concerns are expected and resource values have not changed so the original public involvement process is adequate. The DNA was initiated in e-planning on July 17, 2014. No public inquiry has been received.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Chuck Macdonald	**Natural Resources Specialist**	**Various**
Daniel Emmett	**Wildlife Biologist**	**Wildlife/ T&E animals**
Christine Cimiluca	**Botanist**	**Botany/ T&E plants**
Jimmie McKenzie	**Archaeologist**	**Archeology/Cultural Resources**
Elizabeth Gamber	**Geologist**	**Geology/ Minerals/ Energy Production/ Paleontology**
Dan Gilfillan	**Recreation Planner**	**Recreation**
Katie White Bull	**Realty Specialist**	**Lands/ Access**
Alec Bryan	**Rangeland Management Specialist**	**Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards**

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:

X This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.

☐ This proposal does not conform to the applicable land use plan

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

X 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	8/5/14 Date
Signature of NEPA Coordinator	8/5/14 Date
Signature of the Responsible Official	AUG 08 2014 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:

Appendix A
Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

APPENDIX A

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM CHECKLIST

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2014-0215-DNA

Crescent Point Energy US Corp. Randlett 3D Seismic

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.

Determin-ation	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/2014
NP	BLM Natural Areas	None Present as per GIS layer review and RMP/ROD Review.	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NC	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Jimmie McKenzie	8/1/2014
NC	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document..	Jimmie McKenzie	8/1/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NP	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NC	Environmental Justice	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/2014
NP	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)	No prime or unique farmlands are present as designated by the NRCS in the project area.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/2014
NI	Fuels/Fire Management	No fuel management activities planned for the project area. The proposed project would not conflict with fire management activities.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/14

Determin-ation	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production	No negative impacts to geology and minerals would result from this action.	Elizabeth Gamber	7/24/14
IP/NW: NC	Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation	IP/NW: The analysis of the impact of the Proposed Action on invasive plants and noxious weeds in Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120 and the proposed mitigation measures are sufficient.	Christine Cimiluca	7/28/2014
Soils: NC		Soils: Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/2014
Veg: NC		Veg: Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120 contains sufficient analysis of impacts to vegetation in the Project Area. No additional NEPA analysis is required.	Christine Cimiluca	7/28/2014
NI	Lands/Access	There are a number of different types of rights-of-ways within the proposed project area which have been identified. All surface and underground pipelines and facilities would be avoided by appropriate distances in accordance with the BLM Geophysical Manual. Existing roads would be utilized as travel ways for vehicles.	Katie White Bull	7/23/14
NP	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None Present as per 2008 Vernal RMP ROD and GIS layer review	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NI	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	The Proposed project would occur within the Ouray Road and West Pelican Lake allotments. 92 cattle will be present during a portion of the Seismic survey on the Ouray Road allotment, and 61 Cattle will be present during a portion of the survey on the West Pelican Lake allotment. Short-term surface disturbance equals less than 1 percent of the entire allotments and would only affect livestock movement during the time the crews are working. The proposed seismic survey would not affect livestock grazing or rangeland health to a degree that would require detailed analysis.	Alec Bryan / Craig Newman	7/23/2014
NI	Paleontology	One fossil locality is present on BLM land in T6S R19E Sec 35, but it will be temporarily marked and avoided during the seismic survey (Outlaw Engineering, Nov 18, 2013).	Elizabeth Gamber	7/24/2014
NI	Plants: BLM Sensitive	The following UT BLM Sensitive plant species are present or expected in the same or an adjacent subwatershed as the proposed project: *Yucca sterilis.* • Sandy soils in the vicinity of the proposed project may provide suitable habitat for Yucca sterilis. At least one population has been documented in the Project Area per BLM GIS review. This population is surrounded by documented *Sclerocactus sp.* individuals and would be avoided according to the applicant committed environmental protection measures and required mitigation. This population should not be impacted as a result of the Proposed Action. Given the exclusively clonal nature of the species, the potential for future establishment is negligible. This species was also analyzed in Environmental Assessment No.	Christine Cimiluca	7/28/2014

Determin-ation	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		U&O-FY14-120. Suitable habitat for the following UT BLM Sensitive plant species is present in the Project Area: *Astragalus equisolensis*, *Astragalus hamiltonii*, *Cleomella palmeriana* var. *goodrichii*, and *Cryptantha grahamii*. However, none of these species have been documented in the Project Area and are not anticipated to impacted as a result of the Proposed Action.		
NC	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	The following Federally listed, proposed, or candidate plant species is present or expected in the same or an adjacent subwatershed as the proposed project: Pariette cactus (*Sclerocactus brevispinus*), Uinta Basin hookless cactus (*Sclerocactus wetlandicus*) and Ute ladies'-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*). The Project Area is within the 2013 USFWS potential habitat polygon for *Sclerocactus ssp*. This includes habitat designated as Core Conservation Area (CCA) Level 1 and CCA Level 2. Individuals/populations of cactus have been documented in the Project Area. Suitable habitat for *Spiranthes diluvialis* is present in riparian and wetland areas throughout the Project Area. Section 7 consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) was completed for this project on June 3, 2014. USFWS determined that the project was not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the 3 species. Applicant committed environmental protection measures and additional mitigation would be applied to ensure that there are no adverse effects to the 3 species as a result of the Proposed Action. No additional analysis from what was included in Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120 is required.	Christine Cimiluca	7/28/2014
NP	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	None are present in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review.	Chuck Macdonald	7/18/2014
NI	Recreation	The proposed action would occur partially within the Pelican Lake SRMA; however, the proposed action would cause no surface disturbance and would therefore be no impact to the recreational resources found within the SRMA.	Dan Gilfillan	7/18/2014
NC	Socio-Economics	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/22/2014
NI	Visual Resources	VRM Class IV identified, project would meet class IV objectives.	Dan Gilfillan	7/22/2014
NI	Wastes (hazardous or solid)	No chemicals subject to reporting under SARA Title III in amounts greater than 10,000 pounds would be used, produced, stored, transported, or disposed of annually in association with the project. Trash and other waste materials would be cleaned up and removed immediately after completion of operations.	Chuck Macdonald	7/29/2014

Determin-ation	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NI	Water: Floodplains	A small area is identified in the project area per the Vernal Field Office RMP and GIS review. However, proposed access routes do not cross this area.	Chuck Macdonald	7/22/2014
NC	Water: Groundwater Quality	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/25/2014
NC	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/30/2014
NC	Water: Surface Water Quality	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Chuck Macdonald	7/30/2014
NP	Water: Waters of the U.S.	The proposed project would not impact waters of the U.S.	Chuck Macdonald	7/22/2014
NP	Wild Horses and Burros	No herd areas or herd management areas are present in the project area per BLM GIS database.	Chuck Macdonald	7/22/2014
NC	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Daniel Emmett	8/04/2014
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document.	Daniel Emmett	8/04/2014
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	Upon review of NEPA document, Environmental Assessment No. U&O-FY14-120, it has been determined that there is no change from what was analyzed in the original document. Is the proposed project in sage grouse PPH or PGH? Yes _. If the answer is yes, the project must conform with WO IM 2012-043.	Daniel Emmett	8/04/2014
NP	Woodland / Forestry	None Present as per GIS layer review and RMP/ROD Review	Chuck Macdonald	7/22/2014

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	Stephanie J. Howard	8/5/14	
Authorized Officer	Gary Torres	8-7-2014	