Pecos District

Documentation of Land Use Plan Compliance
And NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
DNA-510-2007-86

Roswell Field Office;

Applicant: Yates Petroleum Corporation
Lease No.: NM-98184
Action Type: APD Extension: Jasper "ARJ" Federal #4
Location of Proposed Action: Section 25, T. 8 S., R. 26 E., 660' FNL & 660' FWL, Unit Letter D, Chaves County, New Mexico, NMPM.
Description of Proposed Action: The proposed APD extension was previously approved and no new changes would occur to the approved plan of development for this well. The DNA approval will update all the new COA changes that have occurred since this well was previously approved. An access road and well pad would be constructed and the gas well would be drilled.

A. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans:

1. Roswell Approved Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision, October 1997.

2. The proposed action does not conflict with any known State or local planning, ordinance or zoning.

B. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

1. RFO EA #: NM-510-06-96	Date Approved: 4/13/06
2. RFO EA #: NM-060-04-96	Date Approved: 4/23/04
3. RFO EA #: NM-060-02-040	Date Approved: 4/24/02

C. NEPA Adequacy Criteria:

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Yes.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances? Yes.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis on the proposed action? Yes.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action? Yes.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged for those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action? Yes.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from the implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Yes.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action? Yes.

D. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet. See attached DNA Checklist.

E. Mitigation Measure:

The provisions for the approval of the DNA include the Roswell Field Office requirements as defined in the following exhibits; **Exhibit A** - Location Map, **Exhibit B** - Well Drilling Requirements, **Exhibit C** - Conditions of Approval, **Exhibit D** - Permanent Resource Road Requirements, **Exhibit E** - Surface Restoration/Reclamation Requirements, of the approved APD.

Conclusion:

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action. This constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

/s/Larry D. Bray

_____

Larry D. Bray, Assistant Field Manager,
Lands and Minerals

3/26/07

_____

Date