United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0063-DNA
February 17, 2016

Statoil Request to Flare
Snyder 1-12-1H

Location: **Roosevelt County, MT**
T. 28 N., R. 57 E., Section 1

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Miles City Field Office
111 Garryowen Road
Miles City, MT 59301
Phone: 406-233-2800
FAX: 406-233-2921

DATE POSTED: January 27, 2015
DATE DUE: February 13, 2015

Worksheet
Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

BLM Office: Miles City Field Office, Miles City, Montana

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0063-DNA

Case File/Project No:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Statoil Oil & Gas LP's request to flare gas produced from the Snyder 1-12-1H producing on Indian lease 14-20-0256-2454 per NTL-4A. This well is also committed to Communitization Agreement 14-20-0256-CA90.

Location/Legal Description: Snyder 1-12-1H, Section 1, T28N-R57E

A: Description of the Proposed Action: To allow flaring of casinghead gas from the Snyder 1-12-1H oil well producing on lease 14-20-0256-2454. The well is connected to a gas sales line. Due to infrastructure capacity constraints, the gas must be flared in order for the well to continue to produce oil. The total gas produced from this well is approximately 149mcf/d with about 10mcf/d used beneficially for lease operations. A portion of the gas may be sold when take away capacity allows.

Applicant: Statoil Oil & Gas, LP
County: Roosevelt County, Montana
DNA Originator: Paul Helland

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* N/A** Date Approved _____

Other document** EA prepared for the BIA, Ft. Peck Agency Date Approved 12-14-2012

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

***The BLM does not write surface NEPA documents for resources on Indian Reservations. That responsibility belongs to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Therefore, there is not a BLM LUP for this proposed action.*

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

N/A The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment for the Snyder 1-12-1H APD prepared by Carlson McCain, Inc. for the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fort Peck Agency, Poplar, MT. (Pages 14, 15, 28, and 31.)

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, this action is similar to the action analyzed in the above mentioned environmental documents and is in the same Class II airshed. The impacts would be similar to the impacts analyzed in the referenced environmental documents. This request is to allow for venting or flaring of the gas produced from the above referenced wells when the gas is not saleable due to sales line capacity.

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, resource values? Yes, the current circumstances and alternatives are similar to the situation analyzed in the referenced documents. The alternatives are to allow the venting or flaring of produced gas or no action (not approve the venting/flaring of gas). If this gas is not vented or flared when circumstances dictate, the well cannot produce oil.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstance would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action? Yes, the existing analysis is valid and the action is in the same airshed analyzed in the referenced EA. Circumstances have not significantly changed regarding air quality in the area.

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 effects are similar to the situation analyzed in the referenced documents. The primary environmental effect from this action would be a slight degradation of air quality in the immediate area of the flare stack.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes, other appropriate agencies are involved. When the operator has approval to flare or vent from the BLM, the Conditions of

Approval to vent or flare state, "This approval does not constitute approval via permit or rule to vent gas from the Oil and Gas Conservation Division, Department of Natural Resource and Conservation of the State of Montana or the Air Quality Division, Montana Department of Health and Environmental Sciences. Venting and flaring cannot occur unless it is in compliance with the aforementioned agencies' permits and administrative rules." Thus other agencies relevant to this action are involved as required.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented	Initials & Date
Paul Helland	Petroleum Engineer	Minerals	PH 2-11-2016

Environmental Coordinator **Date**

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

Please see attached COAs.

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 NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

Shane Findlay
Assistant Field Manager
Division of Mineral Resources

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 the DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

IS THIS IN GREATER SAGE GROUSE GENERAL HABITAT, PRIORITY HABITAT, OR RESTORATION HABITAT?

YES ____ NO _X__

IF YES THIS MUST BE ADDRESSED WITHIN THE DNA.

Statoil Oil & Gas, LP
Snyder 1-12-1H (25-085-21852)
14-20-0256-2454 (14-20-0256-CA90)
Lot 12 Section 1, T28N-R57E
Roosevelt County, Montana

Your NTL-4A application for the above captioned facilities has been approved effective July 9, 2015 as authorized by NTL-4A, IV.B.1. This approval is based on the following:

1. It is necessary to occasionally flare casinghead gas to continue to produce this well.

Terms and Conditions of Approval:

1. No royalty shall accrue if the gas is vented or flared from the above captioned facilities.

2. This approval does not constitute approval via permit or rule to vent gas from the Oil and Gas Conservation Division, Department of Natural Resource and Conservation of the State of Montana or the Air Quality Division, Montana Department of Health and Environmental Sciences. Venting and flaring cannot occur unless it is in compliance with the aforementioned agencies' permits and administrative rules.

3. This approval is in effect until July 1, 2017, unless conditions change that would allow the vented/flared gas to be sold. Approval to vent/flare gas after this date will require another NTL-4A application or evidence submitted on Sundry Notice Form 3160-5 that the same conditions exist for which this approval was given.

If you have any questions, please contact Paul Helland at 406-233-3668.

You have the right to request a State Director Review of this decision and these Conditions of Approval pursuant to 43 CFR 3165.3(b). An SDR request, including all supporting documentation shall be filed with the Montana State Office, State Director (MT-920) at 5001 Southgate Drive, Billings, Montana 59101-4669 within 20 business days of your receipt of this decision. If adversely affected by the State Director's decision, it can be further appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) pursuant to 43 CFR 3165.4, 43 CFR 4.411, and 43 CFR 4.413. Should you fail to timely request an SDR, or after receiving the State Director's decision, fail to timely file an appeal with IBLA, no further administrative review of this decision would be possible.