

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-C010-2015-0021-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-092479 Lease & NVN-089456X Geothermal Unit

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: ORMAT Nevada Inc. Geothermal Drilling Permit 23-8

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T22N, R35E, Section 8

APPLICANT: Ormat Nevada Inc.

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

Ormat Nevada Inc. proposes to drill geothermal observation well as part of their exploration and development of their Dixie Hope Geothermal Project located in Dixie Valley approximately 40 miles east-northeast of Fallon in Churchill County, Nevada. An existing dirt access road would be used to access the proposed drill site. Construction of a pad of up to approximately 150 feet by 200 feet would be required. The proposed drill site is directly adjacent to the project area analyzed in the ORMAT Technologies, Inc., Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Project and FONSI/DR signed 1/17/2012.

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 Technologies, Inc., Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Project and FONSI/DR signed on 1/17/2012.

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 essentially identical to actions analyzed in and immediately adjacent to the project area analyzed in the ORMAT Technologies, Inc., Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Project and FONSI/DR signed on January 17, 2012.

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 2012 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2012 EA is still appropriate. The environmental constraints of the geothermal exploration have not changed and the proposed action is identical to that analyzed in ORMAT Technologies, Inc., Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Project and FONSI/DR signed on January 17, 2012.

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?

Anticipated impacts to the resources have not changed and no new information or circumstances have been identified since signing the FONSI/DR on January 17, 2012. Access to the proposed site will be via overland travel to the extent possible. 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 2012 EA analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from geothermal development would remain unchanged. The 2012 EA analyzed cumulative impacts for up to twenty (20) drill sites of which

fewer than five (5) were constructed. The analyzed action is not different from the construction of the proposed well pads or exploration drilling analyzed in the 2012 EA.

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 2012 EA which describes the public involvement. Consultation with other agencies and interested parties was conducted for that document.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Jason Wright/Kristen Bowen	Archaeologist	BLM <i>JTBW 4/23/15</i>
Christopher Kula	Biologist	BLM <i>CK 3/23/15</i>
Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson	Rangeland Management Spec.	BLM <i>LA 3/23/15</i>
Matt Simons	Realty Specialist	BLM <i>MS 3/23/15</i>
Ken Depaoli/Joel Hartmann	Geologist	BLM <i>KD</i>
Dan Westermeyer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BLM <i>DW 3/23/15</i>
Michelle Stropky	Hydrologist	BLM <i>MMS 03/23/15</i>
Dave Schroeder	Environmental Protection Spec.	BLM <i>DS 3/23/15</i>
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environ Coordinator	BLM <i>ARR 3/23/15</i>
<i>Jill DeVours</i>	<i>weeds</i>	<i>BLM JD 3-23-15</i>

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.

 3/23/15

Signature of Project Lead

 3/23/15

Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Signature of Responsible Official

Date 4/23/2015

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.




Figure 1: Site Map




Figure 5: Google Earth image of 23-8 well pad and existing pad access route