

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

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0094-DNA

PREPARING OFFICE

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



Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0094-DNA

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

Finding of No Significant Impact	ix
Kerr McGee adding two new well bores to their existing NBU 1022–9J well pad	ix
Signature	ix
Decision Record	xi
Decision	xi
Summary of the Selected Alternative	xi
Rationale for the Decision	xi
Appeals	xi
Authorizing Official	xii
Conditions of Approval (COAs)	xii
1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)	1

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1. Well Data xi
Table 1.1. List of Preparers 4
Table 1.2. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist 6

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Equations

1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist	4
---	---

This page intentionally
left blank

Finding of No Significant Impact

Kerr McGee adding two new well bores to their existing NBU 1022-9J well pad

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA), and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

Signature

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

4/27/2015

Authorized Officer

Date

AFM for Minerals

This page intentionally
left blank

Decision Record

Decision

It is my decision to authorize Kerr McGee's proposed wells as described in the proposed action of DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0094-DNA.

Table 1. Well Data

Well Name	Well Number	Legal Location	Lease
NBU	1022-9J1BS	NWSE Sec 9 T10S R22E SLB&M	UTU63047A
NBU	1022-9J1CS	NWSE Sec 9 T10S R22E SLB&M	UTU63047A

Summary of the Selected Alternative

This decision includes the following components:

The addition of two new well bores to Kerr McGee's existing NBU 1022-9J well pad. There would be no new surface disturbance.

Rationale for the Decision

The proposed well and related facilities meet the BLM's purpose and need to allow the lessee to develop the subject mineral lease indicated above. The need for the action is established by BLM Onshore Orders (43 CFR 3160) which require the BLM to review and approve APDs on all operations conducted on a Federal or Indian oil and gas lease, even with split estate lands.

The original on-site, dated 10/23/2013, is sufficient for this project as the issues now are similar to the ones then and there is no new disturbance.

Appeals

This decision is effective upon the date it is signed by the authorized officer. The decision is subject to appeal. Under BLM regulation, this decision is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P.O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84145-0155, within 20 business days of the date this Decision is received or considered to have been received.

If you wish to file a petition for stay, the petition for stay should accompany your notice of appeal and shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits;
3. The likelihood of irreparable harm to the appellant or resources if the stay is not granted;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Authorizing Official

Approved by:

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

4/27/2015

Authorized Officer

Date

AFM for Minerals

Conditions of Approval (COAs)

- All areas of disturbance (including surface pipelines) must have appropriate surface use agreements or approvals in place with the proper owner and/or agency before such action is started.
- The conditions of approval, as set forth by those owners and/or agencies, shall be adhered to.
- All COAs established in the original pad EA DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2014-0091–EA

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

This page intentionally
left blank

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

OFFICE: Vernal, UT

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015-0094-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: UTU63047A


PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Kerr McGee proposes to add two new well bores to their existing NBU 1022-9J well pad.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: NWSE Sec 9 T10S R22E SLB&M

APPLICANT (if any): Kerr McGee Oil & Gas Onshore

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The addition of two new well bores to Kerr McGee's existing NBU 10229J well pad. There would be no new surface disturbance.



ARKOV20130713_NBU_1022-9_FOCUSGISMaps_ABCDENBU_1022-9J_B.mxd2/7/2015 9:11:05 AM

Legend

- Well - Proposed
- Well - Existing
- Well Pad
- Road - Existing
- - - Road - Proposed
- ▬ County Road
- ⚡ Culvert/LWC - Proposed
- Bureau of Land Management
- Indian Reservation
- State
- Private

Total Proposed Road Length: ±0

Chapter 10
B. Land Use Plan Conformance

WELL PAD - NBU 1022-9J

NBU 1022-9H4CS,
NBU 1022-9I1BS, NBU 1022-9H3AS,
NBU 1022-9I1DS, NBU 1022-9G4CS,
NBU 1022-9J1CS & NBU 1022-9J1BS

Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore L.P.

1099 18th Street
Denver, Colorado 80202



CONSULTING, LLC
 2155 North Main Street
 Sheridan, Wyoming 82801
 Phone 307-674-0609
 Fax 307-674-0182

SCALE: 1" = 2,000ft NAD83 USP Central SHEET

LUP Name: Vernal RMP Date Approved: October 2008

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

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 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.

June 2014: Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT- G010-2014-0091–EA“Kerr McGee 1022–9”

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).

Lease UTU63047A.

Cultural Resource Inventory: U-05-MQ-0784b

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, the proposed action is adding two well bores to the approved surface pad where drilling, completion, and production operations relating to leased mineral extraction will occur. Yes: the new well bores will occur in previously analyzed portions of the original well pad area. There are no differences.

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 value?

Yes, the alternatives analyzed are appropriate to the new action. Adding the well bores to an existing well pad is a preferred option to building and operating an additional wells and pads to extract the same minerals.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, recent endangered species listings, updated lists

*Chapter 1 Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.*

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, there are no new resource concerns. The lease allows drilling to occur in the lease areas subject to the stipulations of the specific lease agreement.

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 proposed action is not adding any additional disturbance, so the potential effects and impacts previously analyzed directly relate to the new disturbance area. See question 3 in regards to air quality.

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

Yes, scoping and public involvement were carried out in accordance with BLM NEPA Handbook H-I790-1.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Tyler Cox	Team Lead	Natural Resource Specialist

Note

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

Equation 1.1. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Project Title: Kerr-McGee Oil & Gas Onshore, LP Proposal to add two new well bores to the existing NBU 1022–9J well pad.

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2015–0094–DNA

File/Serial Number: UTU63047A

Project Leader: Tyler Cox

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.

Table 1.2. Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

Determination	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	Air quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010–2014–0091–EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	BLM Natural Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Cultural: Archaeological Resources	The entire project area has been covered by a Class III intensive cultural resource inventory (U-05–MQ-0784b). The results of the survey found no sites in or around the proposed project area. Based on the results of the cultural resource inventories, the BLM made a determination of no historic properties affected (36CFR800.4(d)(1)) for the proposed undertaking. Consultation with the Utah State Historic Preservation (USHPO) was initiated on 08/24/2005. There was no comment/response from the Utah SHPO within the 30–calendar day review window; hence, the 106 process reached its conclusion and the project could proceed.	Leticia Neal	03/26/2015
NC	Cultural: Native American Religious Concerns	Tribal consultations for this area were initiated and closed under the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a) and ROD (BLM 2012b). Please refer to Appendix E of the GNB ROD for documentation of the Tribal consultation process. The proposed action would not hinder access to or use of Native American religious sites.	Leticia Neal	03/26/2015
NC	Designated Areas: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP and ROD/GIS layer review.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Designated Areas: Wild and Scenic Rivers	None Present as per 2008 Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Designated Areas: Wilderness Study Areas	None present as per 2008 Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Environmental Justice	No minority or economically disadvantaged communities or populations would be disproportionately adversely affected by the Proposed Action or alternatives, because none are present in or adjacent to the project area.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Farmlands (prime/unique)	Prime or unique farmlands are not present in the Project Area, as designated by the NRCS.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Fuels/Fire Management	No fire or fuel management activities are planned for the Project Area. The proposed project would not conflict with fire management activities due to the use of existing and proposed well pad operations.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Geology/Minerals/Energy Production	The two additional well bores will have no significant impact on geologic conditions, minerals or energy production. Compliance with Federal regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 3160, as implemented by the BLM Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, will assure that down-hole operations include casing and cementing programs designed to, "protect and/or isolate all...lost circulation zones, abnormally pressured zones, and any prospectively valuable deposits of minerals." Prospectively valuable deposits of minerals in the subsurface include Gilsonite, oil shale and tar sands in addition to oil and gas. Finally, the depletion of oil and gas reserves that would accompany the additional well bores is supported by the 2008 Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan.	Justin Snyder	3/26/2015
NC	Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils & Vegetation	Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010-2014-0091-EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Lands/Access	The Project Area is located within the Vernal Field Office Resource Management Plan Planning Area which allows for oil and gas development with associated road and pipeline right-of-ways. No existing land uses would be changed or modified by the implementation of the Proposed Action; therefore there would be no adverse effects. Per GIS review there are no Public Water Reserves in the project area	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC)	None Present as per 2008 Vernal RMP/ROD and GIS layer review.	Tyler Cox	3/17/2015

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Livestock Grazing & Rangeland Health Standards	<p>The proposed project would be located in the Seven Sisters Sheep Grazing Allotment. The grazing period for the Seven Sisters allotment is grazed from November 1 to April 15 . The project is in an area that is heavily bisected by oil and gas roads, above ground pipelines and oil pads. The proposed project may affect livestock movement patterns, access to water and may affect the allotment with the loss of AUMs due to a cumulative loss of surface vegetation on the Northern end of the allotment.</p> <p>KMG would apply the COAs from the GNB ROD (BLM 2012b) to limit potential impacts to range resources and livestock operations. Directional drilling and completion activities from the existing and expanded well pad locations would result in temporary increases in industrial traffic and would have impact on grazing activities or livestock operations.</p>	Craig L Newman	4/2/2015
NC	Paleontology	As the additional well bores involve no new surface disturbance, there continues to be no impact to paleontological resources as determined by DOI-BLM-G010–2014–0091–EA.	Justin Snyder	3/27/2015
NC	Plants: BLM Sensitive	<p>Suitable habitat for sterile yucca (<i>Yucca sterilis</i>), a UT BLM sensitive plant species, is present in the Project Area. The species could inhabit sandy locations near the Proposed Action; however, surveys of the Project Area conducted in October 2014 identified no populations in the vicinity of the Proposed Action. Given the exclusively clonal nature of the species, the potential for future establishment is negligible.</p> <p>Additional BLM Sensitive plant species are precluded based on soil, elevation, geography and plant population GIS data. Green River shale derived soils are not present.</p>	Jessi Brunson	4/17/2015
NC	Plants: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate	Suitable habitat for the threatened plant species Uinta Basin hookless cactus (<i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i>) is present in the Project Area. The Project Area is located within the 2013 potential habitat established by USFWS for <i>Sclerocactus ssp.</i> , including <i>Sclerocactus wetlandicus</i> , per BLM GIS review. The Project Area is not located within designated Core 1 or 2 habitat for the species. Surveys conducted in October 2014 showed no plants in the immediate project area, with the nearest documented plants approximately 800 feet away, as per BLM GIS review. The proposed action falls under the decision and stipulations of the final biological opinion (completed May 2012) for the Greater Natural Buttes Project Area (UT–080–07–807).	Jessi Brunson	4/17/2015

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Plants: Wetland/Riparian	Inventoried and observed riparian areas are absent in the Project Area. As a result, no impacts to wetlands/riparian zones are anticipated as a result of proposed project activities.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Recreation	No developed recreation sites/trails or Special Recreation Management Areas (SRMAs) exist within the Project Area. The Project Area is located in the Vernal Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA), which has limited recreational use. Based on the lack of existing developed recreation sites and use, impacts from implementation of proposed activities would be minimal.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Socio-Economics	No impact to the social or economic status of the county or nearby communities would occur from this project due to its small size in relation to ongoing development throughout the basin. Cumulative effects on socio-economic conditions resulting from past, present, and future development (including the Proposed Action) are described in the GNB Final EIS (BLM 2012a)	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Visual Resources	All proposed development would be on VRM Class IV were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010-2014-0091-EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Wastes (hazardous/solid)	Hazardous materials were sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010-2014-0091-EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Water: Floodplains	All construction activities would avoid HUD inventoried floodplains.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NI	Water: Groundwater Quality	The two additional well bores will have no significant impact on ground water. Compliance with Federal regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 3160, as implemented by the BLM Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, will assure that down-hole operations protect and/or isolate all useable water through the use of steel casing and cement.	Justin Snyder	3/27/ 2015
NC	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater)	Water: Hydrologic Conditions (stormwater) was sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010-2014-0091-EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Water: Surface Water Quality	Water: Surface Water Quality was sufficiently analyzed within the EA DOI-BLM-G010-2014-0091-EA.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015

Determination	Resource/Issue	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Water: Waters of the U.S.	The proposed access road would not cross any identified wetlands or waters of the U.S.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Wild Horses	The Project Area is not located in a wild horse Herd Area/Herd Management Area. Therefore, impacts to wild horses are not anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015
NC	Wildlife: Migratory Birds (including raptors)	Migratory birds are present in the Project Area and could be affected by surface disturbance and temporary displacement due to other project-related activity. There are no known or documented raptor nests within project area.	Dan Emmett	4/24/ 2015
NC	Wildlife: Non-USFWS Designated	No wildlife designated areas have been identified relevant to the Project Area. Fish have been covered in previous document.	Dan Emmett	4/24/ 2015
NC	Wildlife: Threatened, Endangered, Proposed or Candidate	There is no designated T&E habitat within project area. Fish have been covered in previous document. Is the proposed project in sage grouse PPH or PGH? No If the answer is yes, the project must conform with WO IM 2012-043.	Dan Emmett	4/24/ 2015
NC	Woodlands/Forestry	None Present as per Vernal Field Office RMP/ROD and GIS database.	Tyler Cox	3/17/ 2015

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 requirement of NEPA.

/s/ Tyler Cox

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Jessica Taylor

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Jerry Kenczka

Signature of the Responsible Official

4/27/2015

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 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.