

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
White River Field Office
73544 Hwy 64
Meeker, CO 81641

DOCUMENTATION OF LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE AND NEPA ADEQUACY

NUMBER: CO-110-2004- 011-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (optional): COC-63733

PROJECT NAME: APD for Hells Hole #9152B

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T2S, R103W, NWNE Sec. 18, 6th P.M.

APPLICANT: EnCana Oil & Gas (USA) Inc.

ISSUES AND CONCERNS (optional): N/A

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The applicant proposes to directionally drill one well from the same existing vertical well pad. The access road, well pad, pipeline and existing vertical well #9152 were approved and analyzed in CO-110-2004-003-EA.

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: White River Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP).

Date Approved: July 1, 1997

Other Document: N/A

Date Approved: N/A

X The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s) (listed by page number from the ROD/RMP):

Page 2-5: “Make federal oil and gas resources available for leasing and development in a manner that provides reasonable protection for other resource values.”

_____ 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):

REVIEW OF EXISTING NEPA DOCUMENTS:

List by name and date all existing NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

Name of Document: CO-110-2004-003-EA

Date Approved: 11/20/03

List by name and date any other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Name of Document: N/A

Date Approved: N/A

NEPA ADEQUACY CRITERIA:

1. Is the Proposed Action substantially the same action and at the site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The current proposed action is substantially the same action as previously analyzed in CO-110-2004-003-EA.

2. Was a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s), and does that range and analysis appropriately consider current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternatives analyzed in CO-110-2004-003-EA is appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests and resource values.

3. Does the information or circumstances upon which the existing NEPA document(s) are based remain valid and germane to the Proposed Action? Is the analysis still valid in light of new studies or resource assessment information?

Documentation of answer and explanation: There is no new information or circumstance which would invalidate the existing analysis.

4. Does the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document CO-110-2004-003-EA continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document CO-110-2004-003-EA. The existing NEPA document CO-110-2004-003-EA analyzed site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Action unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action are unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document CO-110-2004-003-EA.

7. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the Proposed Action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document CO-110-2004-003-EA are adequate for the proposed action.

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this work sheet (by name and title).

The proposed action was presented to, and reviewed by the White River Field Office interdisciplinary team on 11/13/03.
Date

A list of resource specialists who participated in this review is available upon request from the White River Field Office.

REMARKS:

Cultural Resources: Avoidance and monitoring stipulations were identified as adequate mitigation in CO-110-2004-003-EA. No new information has been introduced to indicate that these stipulations are not adequate.

Native American Religious Concerns: There are no known Native American Religious Concerns

Threatened and Endangered Species: Threatened and endangered species were not an issue in the original EA. There is no new information indicating that this situation has changed.

MITIGATION: All conditions of approval for well #6152 are still in effect and applicable to the additional well proposed on the existing well pad. Conditions of approval are attached.

COMPLIANCE PLAN (optional): N/A

NAME OF PREPARER: 

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: 

DATE: 12/22/03

CONCLUSION

CO-110-2004-011-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

Kent T. Walker

Field Manager

DATE SIGNED:

12/23/03

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.