Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
Worksheet

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

STILLWATER FIELD OFFICE: LLNVC01000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C010–2015–022–DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N30–15–009 GDP, NVN-077272 Geothermal Lease

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Geothermal Drilling Permit for Production Well 16C-36

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: MDM T. 17 N., R. 30 E., Section 36

APPLICANT (if any): Enel Salt Wells, LLC

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Enel Salt Wells, LLC proposes to drill a geothermal production well as part of their continued development of geothermal resources in the Salt Wells lease area southeast of Fallon, Nevada. This same location has been the site of two previous geothermal observation wells – 16-36 drilled in 2012, 16A-36 drilled in 2014 and 16B-36 drilled in 2015. The drilling of a geothermal production well at this location will require the expansion of the current drill pad to approximately 250' X 250' in order to accommodate a full size drill rig and ancillary equipment. The existing two track road will be used for access to the site.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	**Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan**	Date Approved:	May 9, 2001

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto*

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

MIN-1, Desired Outcomes 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.

MIN-5, Standard Operating Procedures, Leasable Minerals 5.; 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.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Carson City Field Office – Salt Wells Geothermal Plant Development Environmental Assessment, EA-NV-030-05-08 and FONSI/DR signed 2/25/2005.

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 within the same project area analyzed in the Salt Wells Geothermal Plant Development Environmental Assessment, EA-NV-030-05-08 and FONSI/DR signed 2/25/2005. The proposed area has been culturally cleared. Access to the proposed well location would use existing two-track roads.

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, environmental concerns, interests, and resources have not changed since the completion of the 2005 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2005 EA is still appropriate since the environmental constraints of the geothermal development have not changed.

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 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 Pale Kangaroo Mouse (*Microdipodops pallidus*) was added to the BLM sensitive species list in 2011 and may occur in the project area. However, impacts to any resident individuals would be similar to those for other rodent species analyzed in the 2005 EA. Access would be via an existing two-track road and total temporary surface disturbance would be approximately 1.4 acres.

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 2005 EA analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from geothermal development would remain unchanged because the area in question was analyzed for construction of drill pad(s) and/or power plant(s). The proposed action is not different from these previous actions.

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

Yes, the geothermal resource exploration and development operations analyzed in the 2005 EA which describes the public involvement. Consultation with the Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, other agencies, and interested parties was conducted for the 2005 EA

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table . List of Preparers

Name	Title	Signature
~~Linda Appel~~/Chelsy Simerson	Rangeland Management Specialist	Chelsy Simerson 5/4/2015
Jill Devaurs	~~Land Law Examiner~~/Weed Specialist	5/4/2015
Joel Hartmann/Ken Depaoli	Geologist	5/4/15
Chris Kula	Wildlife Biologist	5/4/15
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	5/4/15
Dave Schroeder	Environmental Protection Specialist	5/7/15
Matt Simons	Realty Specialist	MS 5/4/15
Michelle Stropky	Hydrologist	MCS 05/04/2015
Daniel Westermeyer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	5/4/15
Jason Wright/Kristen Bowen	Archaeologist	5/4/15

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 requirement of NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of the Responsible Official — Date: 5/7/2015

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute and 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.