

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-C010-2015-0032-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: N30-15-027 GS, Geothermal Lease NVN-012863

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Dixie Valley Power Plant Well 73B-7 Existing Sump Expansion

LOCATION/LLEGAL DESCRIPTION: MDM T. 24 N., R. 37 E., section 7

APPLICANT (if any): Terre-Gen Dixie Valley, LLC

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Terra-Gen Dixie Valley, LLC is proposing to extend the existing sump at well 73B-7 to allow surface discharge of low pressure (LP) overflow from the Dixie Valley Power Plant and geothermal fluid from well 73B-7 itself. The existing, roughly one acre, sump would be expanded to a length of approximately 465 feet on the north, east and west sides and 340 feet on the south side. The newly enlarged sump would cover approximately four acres. The depth of the expanded sump would be approximately 10 feet and a minimum of two feet of free board would be maintained. The entire sump would have a clay liner and be fenced along the perimeter. Only geothermal fluids would be placed in the sump. In order to conduct fluids from the power plant to the sump an approximately 480 foot 24 inch diameter steel pipe would be laid on top of the ground from the LP drain at the power plant to the enlarged sump. The area proposed to be excavated has been previously disturbed by geothermal operations and prior to that, alfalfa farming. An application has been submitted to Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Bureau of Water Pollution Control and any discharge would be contingent on approval of the proper permit(s).

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name* NV - Carson City Date Approved: May 9, 2001
RMP

**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 dantation, 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 District Office — Oxbow Geothermal Corporation, Environmental Assessment
Dixie Valley Geothermal Project, April 21, 1986

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 identical to actions analyzed and within the project area analyzed in the Dixie Valley Geothermal Project EA. The proposed area has been culturally cleared and is immediately adjacent to active geothermal operations.

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 environmental concerns, interests, and resources in the proposed project area have not changed since the completion of the Dixie Valley Geothermal Project EA. The alternatives considered in that document continue to be appropriate for the proposed action within the proposed project area.

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 resources within the proposed project area have not changed. Because the proposed project area is immediately adjacent to geothermal operations, ongoing since the 1980s, analysis of the proposed action would not be substantially changed by any new information or circumstances.

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 Dixie Valley Geothermal Project EA analyzed impacts to relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from geothermal development would remain unchanged because the proposed project area is currently and has been disturbed by previous geothermal operations.

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

Yes, the geothermal resource development operations analyzed in the Dixie Valley Geothermal EA which describes the public involvement and consultation with local governments, other agencies, and interested parties.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1. List of Preparers

Name	Title	Signature
David Schroeder	Environmental Protection Specialist	<i>DS</i> 6.22.15
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	<i>AR</i> 6/22/15
Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson	Rangeland Management Specialist	<i>LA</i> 6/25/15
Joel Hartmann/Ken Depaoli	Geologist	<i>RD</i> 6/22/15
Chris Kula	Wildlife Biologist	<i>CK</i> 6/22/15
Matt Simons	Realty Specialist	<i>MS</i> 6/22/15
Michelle Stropky	Hydrologist	<i>MCS</i> 6/23/15
Ken Vicencio	Weed Coordinator	<i>KV</i> 6/29/15
Daniel Werstermeyer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	<i>DW</i> 6-22-15
Jason Wright/Kristen Bowen	Archaeologist	<i>JW</i> 6/22/15

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.

Table 2. Cooperating Agencies

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.

Daniel J. Schroeder

 Signature of Project Lead

Angelica Rose

 Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Teresa J. Kuntz _____ *6/30/2015*
 Signature of the 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.