

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-C010-2015-0006-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-077272

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

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

APPLICANT: Enel Salt Wells, LLC

A. Description of the 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 and 16A-36 drilled in 2014. 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 (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: **Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan**

Date Approved: May 9, 2001

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.

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 values?

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, 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?

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 the public involvement and interagency review 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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Agency Represented</u>
Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson	Rangeland Management Specialist	BLM <i>12/15</i>
Jill Devaurs	Land Law Examiner/Weed Coordinator	BLM <i>1-12-15</i>
Chris Kula	Wildlife Biologist	BLM <i>1-12-15</i>
Dan Westermeyer	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BLM <i>1/12/15</i>
Jason Wright/Kristin Bowen	Archaeologist	BLM <i>1/13/15</i>
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM <i>1/12/15</i>
Ken Depaoli/Joel Hartmann	Geologist	BLM <i>1/12/15</i>
Dave Schroeder	Natural Resource Specialist	BLM <i>1/12/15</i>
Matt Simons	Lands and Realty	BLM <i>1/12/15</i>
Michelle Stropky	Hydrologist	BLM <i>01/13/15</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.



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Signature of Responsible Official

Date 1/14/2015

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.