Attachment 1

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Utah Bureau of Land Management

This worksheet is to be completed consistent with guidance provided in instructional text boxes on the worksheet and the 'Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet' located at the end of the worksheet. The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

A. BLM Office: Richfield Field Office
Lease/Serial/Case File: Not Applicable
Proposed Action Title/Type: Leasing for Oil and Gas as offered by competitive leasing under the Minerals Act of 1920, as amended.
Location of Proposed Action: Multiple townships in Sanpete and Piute Counties, Utah.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Public land in the Richfield Field Office has been nominated by the public for Federal oil and gas leasing. A list of the parcels of public land that have been nominated and a map showing the parcels are included in Attachment DNA-1.

Leasing for oil and gas is allowed under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended. Parcels of land nominated by the public are offered for leasing through a competitive process, and a competitive lease sale is held each quarter of the year. The subject parcels would be offered in the February 2006 competitive lease sale. If a parcel is not leased through competitive bidding, then for two years following the competitive sale, the parcel would be available through a noncompetitive sale. A lease, once issued, may be held for a primary term of 10 years. After 10 years, the lease expires unless oil and/or gas are produced, and if there is production, then a lease is held for as long as production is in paying quantities.

Based on land use planning, parcels offered for lease are subject to four leasing categories. These categories are:

- Category 1: Open to leasing, subject to standard lease terms,
- Category 2: Open to leasing, subject to standard lease terms and special stipulations,

- Category 3: Open to leasing, subject to standard lease terms and no surface occupancy, and
- Category 4: Not open to leasing.

The parcels nominated for leasing include land in Categories 1, 2, and 3

Applicant (if any):

Industry representatives have nominated public land for the leasing of Federal oil and gas.

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

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

Land Use Plan:	Date Approved:
Mountain Valley Management Framework Plan	1982

Other documents:	Date Approved:
None	N/A

The parcels in the Richfield Field Office are in Sanpete and Piute Counties and are subject to the Mountain Valley Management Framework Plan. As stated at section M-3.1 of the Mountain Valley MFP, the decision related to oil and gas is to accept the multiple use recommendation, which is to implement leasing of public land in accordance with the category system.

Some of the subject parcels have split estate, where the surface estate is non-federal and the oil and gas estate is federal. The decision in the Mountain Valley MFP applies to all public land, which is defined in Sec. 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976 as "* * * any land and interest in land owned by the United States * * * administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management * * *."

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action:

- Oil and Gas Leasing Environmental Assessment Record, 43-050-5-31, Bureau of Land Management, Richfield District (1975), subsequently referred to as the Richfield District Oil and Gas EA,

- Environmental Analysis Record, Oil and Gas Leasing, Fillmore District, Bureau of Land Management (1975, completion date), subsequently referred to as the Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA,
- Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS (1984), subsequently referred to as the CHL EIS, and
- Oil and Gas Leasing Implementation EA for Henry Mountain and Sevier River Resource Areas (1988), UT 050-89-024, subsequently referred to as the Implementation EA.

The 1975 Fillmore and Richfield District Oil and Gas EAs address leasing for oil and gas programmatically. In 1975, when the oil and gas leasing EAs were written, public land in Sanpete County was included in the Fillmore District, and public land in Piute County was included in the Richfield District. In 1976, district boundaries were redrawn, and public land in Sanpete County was administratively transferred from the Fillmore to the Richfield District. Thus, the Fillmore Oil and Gas EA is applicable to the parcels in Sanpete County, and the Richfield Oil and Gas EA is applicable to the parcels in Piute County. Then, in the mid-1990s, public land in these two counties became part of the Richfield Field Office, which is now the administrative office. All public land in these two counties, including the parcels for this sale, are subject to the Mountain Valley MFP.

In 1988, the Implementation EA was prepared to address leasing in the Sevier River Resource Area, which was part of the Richfield District, and the Sevier River Resource Area included public land in Piute and Sanpete Counties. This EA allows for leasing as directed in the Mountain Valley MFP. The Richfield District Oil and Gas EA was cited in the Implementation EA; however, by oversight, the Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA was not specifically cited. However, the applicable land use plan in 1988 was the Mountain Valley MFP, and that plan addresses leasing of public land in Piute and Sanpete Counties.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

The proposed action has been reviewed by BLM specialists, which have expertise in natural resources. Documentation of this review of the existing NEPA record and the environmental analysis is provided through an Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Checklist (Attachment DNA-1). The documentation and explanation to each of the adequacy criteria are based on this interdisciplinary approach and review.

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

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

In the 1975 Richfield and Fillmore District Oil and Gas EAs, the proposed action is to

lease public lands that are administered by the Bureau of Land Management for oil and gas exploration and development. Activities that could be associated with oil and gas exploration and development are described as petroleum operations that progress through five phases, which include: preliminary investigations, exploratory drilling, development, production, and abandonment. Operations normally progress from one phase to the next, although abandonment may follow any one stage or two or more stages could occur concurrently in a given area. Although some variation in the discussion may be noted, both EAs have a detailed description of the proposed action and the possible oil and gas activities that may occur, if leasing is allowed. The proposed action is addressed in the 1975 EAs at:

- Richfield District Oil and Gas EA, p. 1-25.
- Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA, p. 1-11.

In the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 1-2), oil and gas leasing would be allowed on the subject parcels, subject to the land use plans and subject to the leasing categories that are identified in those plans. The appropriate leasing categories are identified in this EA on p. 4, 5, 8-10, and Appendix 1. This EA references the "original EA" of the Richfield District. As stated at Section C of this document, the Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA was unintentionally omitted from reference in the Implementation EA. The leasing categories are identified and delineated for public land within the field office, and the category designations are consistent with 1975 Fillmore and Richfield District Oil and Gas EAs and the approved land use plan. As previously stated, the subject parcels include public land in Category 1, subject to standard lease terms; Category 2, subject to special stipulations; and Category 3, subject to no surface occupancy.

The proposed action—leasing for oil and gas in the February 2006 sale—is substantially the same as the proposed action analyzed in each of the above environmental documents. Public land would be offered for leasing, and exploration and development for oil and gas resources may occur dependent on specific approval by the BLM and dependent on site-specific NEPA analysis. If land is leased, a lessee would be afforded rights to explore for and to develop oil and gas, subject to the lease terms, regulations, and laws.

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?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

In the 1975 District Oil and Gas EAs, BLM evaluated one alternative to leasing which is to not allow leasing. The no leasing alternative is described in each District Oil and Gas EA as follows:

- Richfield District Oil and Gas EA, p. 26.
- Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA, p. 11.

In the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 2), an alternative is not evaluated, "(b)ecause this assessment finds no significant impact from the analysis of the proposal," which is to allow for leasing. Therefore, other alternatives were not considered in the existing NEPA record, because the impacts to the environment from oil and gas leasing are adequately analyzed and no further study of alternatives is warranted.

3. **Is existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?**

   _X_ Yes
   ___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

A review of the proposed action has been completed and is documented in the Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record (Attachment DNA-1). Significant new information or a significant change in circumstance has not been identified by the BLM resource specialists; however, new information or circumstance is described below.

Cultural Resources and Native American Consultation

Based on existing information concerning cultural resources, the proposed leases are anticipated to have low densities of sites, and impacts to cultural resources could be mitigated by appropriate measures when on-the-ground exploration and development is proposed. If actual surface disturbing activities are proposed on a lease, site specific cultural resource inventories would be conducted at that time and appropriate Section 106 consultation would be completed. In addition, impacts to cultural resources are not anticipated, because adequate protection can be afforded under the standard terms of an oil and gas lease and the stipulation required by WO IM 2005-003. That stipulation is:

> This lease may be found to contain historic properties and/or resources protected under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), American Indian Religious Freedom Act, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, E.O. 13007, or other statutes and executive orders. The BLM will not approve any ground disturbing activities that may affect any such properties or resources until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the NHPA and other authorities. The BLM may require modification to exploration or development

proposals to protect such properties, or disapprove any activity that is likely to result in adverse effects that cannot be successfully avoided, minimized or mitigated.

The Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Uinta and Ouray Ute Tribe, and the Hopi Tribe were notified by certified mail of the proposed leasing by letter that were mailed on Ocotober 21, 2005. Copies of these letters are included in Attachment DNA-1. In addition, all tribes would be afforded an opportunity to comment again, if on-the-ground operations, involving surface disturbance, are proposed on a lease.

Based upon the above review, a determination of "No Adverse Effect" applies to all the subject parcels of this proposed action. This determination is in accord with the State Protocol Agreement between the BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer.

Wilderness Characteristics

Parcel UT 026-011 is partially overlapped by lands that the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) proposed for wilderness consideration, as part of the land use planning for the Richfield Field Office. BLM reviewed the supplemental information that was submitted by SUWA and concluded that the land proposed by SUWA for wilderness "may have" wilderness character, based on guidance in the BLM Handbook H-6310-1. However, that handbook has been rescinded. Under the current guidance for land use planning, BLM may consider the components of wilderness characteristics (naturalness, opportunity for primitive recreation, and solitude) as part of all the resources managed by BLM when revising a land use plan. Although impacts could occur to naturalness, if oil and gas exploration and development are authorized on a lease for this parcel, the impact to naturalness is not sufficiently significant to require a new environmental analysis. The rationale is: The land in Parcel UT0206-011, which *may have* wilderness characteristics, is a relatively small portion of the total area that was proposed for wilderness consideration. Impacts to naturalness on this parcel would not substantially impact the remainder of the lands that may have wilderness characteristics. In addition, the findings of two previous inventories for wilderness lands, as completed by the BLM in the 1970-80s and mid-1990s, were that the subject parcels lacks wilderness character. Under the current land use plan, the parcel is open to leasing, subject to standard lease terms. Offering this parcel is in conformance to the existing land use plan, and BLM does not have a preferred alternative which would warrant deferring this parcel due to any wilderness consideration.

Clarification of the Special Stipulations

Discrepancies were noted in the special stipulations for some of the subject parcels. These minor changes are noted on the preliminary list in Attachment DNA-1 and are in conformance with the land use plan and the 1988 Implementation EA.

Summary of New Information and/or Circumstance

New information or circumstance that would render the existing environmental analysis as inadequate is unknown at this time. The identified new information and/or circumstance is considered as insignificant with regard to the analysis in the existing NEPA record.

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

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The methodology and the analysis in the 1975 District Oil and Gas EAs are appropriate for the current proposed action. The proposed action and the existing environment are described in the NEPA documents, and the anticipated and residual impacts are considered and evaluated with respect to the elements of the environment that may be affected, if the proposed action were authorized. Anticipated and residual impacts in the 1975 EAs are inclusive of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts. In addition, short-term use versus long-term productivity, irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources, possible mitigations to reduce or eliminate anticipated impacts to the elements of the environment, and enhancing measures have been evaluated. An alternative, no leasing, has also been analyzed. This methodology—describing the proposed action, alternative actions, and the affected environment; analyzing the potential impacts to elements of the environment; and evaluating proposed mitigations—is consistent with the current BLM NEPA guidance and is appropriate in evaluating the possible consequences of leasing.

The 1988 Implementation EA evaluates oil and gas leasing as directed and allowed under the Mountain Valley MFP. In addition, this EA (p. 1) incorporates the 1984 CHL EIS by reference, which addressed the guidelines for the leasing category system. In the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 4, 5, 8-10, and Appendix 1), the oil and gas leasing categories are designated for public land in the Richfield Field Office. As stated in the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 1), the decisions in the land use plan are not modified. Rather the decisions in the land use plan are implemented by supporting the compliance with the NEPA process (p. 1). Through the process of preparing the 1988 Implementation EA, the BLM is assured that public land available for leasing is offered in the appropriate leasing category and that appropriate special stipulations are attached to an authorized lease. This methodology is considered appropriate to the current proposed action.

In the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 2-3), a reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) was analyzed for oil and gas exploration and development. The RFD includes one exploratory well per year, based on historical activity.

Exploration methodology has changed somewhat, since the NEPA record was completed. In general, exploration and development involves less surface disturbance than was

envisioned in the existing NEPA record. Equipment for geophysical operations involves smaller trucks for drilling shot holes and for vibrating, and heliportable drilling is utilized where vehicles cannot be reasonably driven cross-country. Co-locating wells on a single well pad also is considered as an alternative to constructing an access and well pad for each well. These methodologies are considered based upon topography, existing access, exploration targets, and the feasibility of each method.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Do the existing NEPA documents analyze impacts related to the current proposed action at a level of specificity appropriate to the proposal (plan level, programmatic level, project level)?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The 1975 District Oil and Gas EAs evaluated the anticipated and residual impacts that could result from oil and gas leasing on a programmatic basis. Possible mitigating or enhancing measures as well as recommended mitigations or enhancements are addressed in the EAs. The impact analysis and mitigations, as appropriate, have been incorporated into the land use plan and are implemented through the 1988 Implementation EA through the leasing category system. The impacts, which are evaluated in the District Oil and Gas Leasing EAs and 1988 Implementation EA, are essentially the same now as when the EAs were prepared.

Anticipated and residual impacts are addressed in the 1975 EAs at:

- Fillmore District Oil and Gas EA, p. 61-91 (anticipated impacts); p.173-177 (residual impacts).
- Richfield District Oil and Gas EA, p. 50-79 (anticipated impacts); p.122-128 (residual impacts).

The impacts of geophysical exploration, drilling for oil and gas, and development were addressed programmatically not site specifically. If an operator or lessee were to propose geophysical exploration, drilling of a well, or development of production facilities, then a written proposal would be required, and the action would require approval prior to such exploration or development. As stated in the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 3), the site-specific analysis and mitigation would be completed under an NEPA document for the specific proposal at the time of a specific application. As a further note, geophysical exploration does not require a lease, and applications for geophysical exploration would be considered, subject to the land use plan and a site-specific environmental analysis, regardless of whether a lease is authorized.

6. Are the reasonably foreseeable cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)?

_X_ Yes
___ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

As stated in the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 3), oil and gas exploration and development on public land administered by the Richfield Field Office has historically involved an average of one exploration well per year. Based on that trend, one well per year for exploration was projected as a reasonable foreseeable development scenario as stated in the Implementation EA (p. 3, 11), and the anticipated impacts were projected to be approximately 78 acres on public land during the subsequent 13 years. From 1988 to 2003, oil and gas activity much less than one well per year, and all wells on public land were plugged and abandoned with the surface reclaimed.

In 2003, oil was discovered in Sevier County, when a well was drilled on private land near Kings Meadow, south of Sigurd. This discovery has spurred an increase interest in oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development. A new oil field, the Covenant, has been established in central Utah.

From 2003 to the present, 12 oil and gas wells have been permitted in the vicinity of Sevier Valley. Ten wells are at Kings Meadow in the Covenant field, and eight of these 10 wells required BLM approval of an Application for Permit to Drill (APD). These wells are located on two pad areas with one on public land and the other one on private land. The BLM also has approved a production, transmission-line corridor at Kings Meadow. Two other wells are near Twist Canyon, north of Salina, and a federal action was involved with the approval of an APD and an access to a state lease. In addition, a central production facility is being constructed on private land, that does not involve a federal action, and that facility will include a disposal well.

Total surface disturbance from the oil and gas activity in the vicinity of Sevier Valley includes approximately 29 acres on public land and 57 acres on non-federal land for a total surface disturbance of 86 acres.

At this time, an APD for public land, south of Mayfield, is being processed by the BLM. This operation, if approved, would include approximately 9 acres of federal land, and a total disturbance of 11 acres.

In addition, geophysical operations have increased in association with drilling. From 1988 through 2003, Richfield FO approved six Notices of Intent to Conduct Geophysical Operations (NOI). From 2004 to the present, six seismic operations have involved BLM approval or are being reviewed for approval. Geophysical operations were not included in the reasonable foreseeable development scenario in 1988; however, the surface

disturbances associated with seismic operations have been negligible to minimal. Federal oil and gas leases are not required for seismic exploration on public land, and regardless of whether leases are issued, geophysical exploration may occur, although seismic exploration could be less likely to occur, if industry cannot obtain federal leases. Geophysical operations were not included in the in the RFD in the 1988 Implementation EA.

Three wells are proposed for drilling on the Manti-LaSal National Forest in Sanpete County. These APDs are federal actions within the administrative unit of the Richfield Field Office for oil and gas leasing, although the surface is National Forest System lands.

The residual impacts, short-term versus long-term productivity, and irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources as addressed in the 1975 District Oil and Gas EAs. The unavoidable adverse impacts as addressed in the 1988 Implementation EA have not changed since previously considered in those documents. The District Oil and Gas EAs programmatically address all phases of oil and gas exploration and development, which range from preliminary investigations to abandonment, and the analysis of these impacts would be substantially unchanged from 1975 to the present.

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

_X_ Yes
____ No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The public was allowed an opportunity to comment on the NEPA documents that were prepared in 1975 and 1988, and the public was allowed to participate in the land use planning that resulted in the Mountain Valley MFP in 1982. In 1975, the public was notified of the environmental review for oil and gas leasing through public meetings, news releases, and radio broadcasts (1975 District Oil and Gas EAs). The public was allowed to review and comment on the 1988 Implementation EA (p. 13).

For the current lease sale in February 2006, the public again has been offered the opportunity to provide comments or to be involved in the process. The proposed sale and the NEPA review have been posted for public review and comment. A decision to lease by the BLM is subject to protest.

The BLM notified Native American tribes of the proposed lease offer on October 21, 2005. The letters are in Attachment DNA-1. No response has been received to date.

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

The team members are identified in Attachment DNA-1.

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.

As stated in a previous section (Criterion 3 for NEPA adequacy), parcels in this sale will have a lease notice in accordance with Bureau policy as well as inventories and professional knowledge of cultural resources. In addition, lease stipulations have been identified in the applicable land use plans. These lease stipulations will be attached in conformance with plans and as identified on the preliminary list of parcels.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that:

Plan Conformance:

- ☑ This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.
- ☐ This proposal does not conform to the applicable land use plan

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

- ☑ The existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.
- ☐ The existing NEPA documentation does not fully cover the proposed action. Additional NEPA documentation is needed if the project is to be further considered.

Rodney P. Lee — 11-17-05

Rod Lee, NEPA Coordinator — Date

Wayne A. Wetzel — 17 Nov 2005

Wayne A. Wetzel, Associate Field Manager — Date

Note: The signed conclusion at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.

Attachment: Interdisciplinary Team Analysis Record Checklist including additional resource reports and clearances, Preliminary February 2006 List for Richfield Field Office, and maps (multiple pages)

ATTACHMENT DNA-1

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

Project Title: Oil and Gas Lease Sale, February 2006

NEPA Log Number: UT-050-06-002 DNA

File/Serial Number: Not Applicable

Project Leader: Michael Jackson

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions
NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required
PI = present with potential for significant impact analyzed in detail in the EA; or identified in a DNA as requiring further analysis
NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section C of the DNA form.

Det ermi-nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		CRITICAL ELEMENTS		
NC	Air Quality	Existing NEPA documentation adequately addresses air quality.	Phil Zieg	10/29/05
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	There are no lands designated as an ACEC present. There are no lands present which are under consideration for possible designation as an ACEC in the new RMP. The existing NEPA documentation is appropriate	Tim Finger	10/21/05
NI	Cultural Resources	Cultural resources are or could be present in all lease areas but, given the low site densities indicated by current information, there is room on each lease parcel to locate at least one well pad, ancillary facilities and reasonable access and still avoid any cultural resources that may be present. (See Staff Report: Cultural Resources, February 2006 Oil & Gas Lease Parcels: October 21, 2005).	Craig Harmon	11/8/05
NC	Environmental Justice	Impacts to local communities and economies are addressed in the existing NEPA record. Leasing would not adversely affect opportunities for minority or disadvantaged groups.	Michael Jackson	11/1/05
NI	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)	Prime and unique farmland was not specifically addressed in existing O&G EA's. Any actions that would cause a parcel of prime or unique farmland to fall outside the criteria for identifying prime or unique farmland, (as specified in 7CFR657.5) and for which mitigation efforts would not return the parcel to meeting the criteria, would need to be further addressed at the time of an application for exploration and development if deemed having potential impacts on prime and unique farmland.	Brant Hallows	10/28/05
NC	Floodplains	Although existing O&G EA's do not specifically address floodplains, floodplains are indirectly but adquately addressed in discussions of drainages, streams, rivers, lakes, ponds, waterholes, seeps, and marshes. Proposed action will not be contrary to Executive Order 11988-Floodplain Management.	Brant Hallows	10/28/05
NI	Invasive, Non-native Species	There would be no impact due to the lease however when exploration and drilling are applied for noxious weeds will need to	Burke Williams	10-27-05

Det ermi-nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		be addressed. Noxious weeds were not addressed in previous NEPA.		
NI	Native American Religious Concerns	Letters containing notification of this lease sale and the results of our cultural resources records search were sent to the following Tribes on October 21, 2005: 1) the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, 2) the Uinta and Ouray Ute Tribe, and 3) the Hopi Tribe detailing the lease proposal and requesting their comments if they had any concerns with it. To date, no response has been received. However, if any concerns are raised subsequently by the tribes, those concerns will be addressed as necessary. Consultation will be considered complete if tribal response presents no objections or if response is not received seven (7) days prior to the date of the proposed sale. Additional consultation will be conducted should site-specific use authorization requests be received. As the proposal becomes more site-specific, tribes will again be notified and given further opportunity for comment.	Craig Harmon	11/8/05
NP	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species	Refer to clearance.	Larry Greenwood	10-30-05
NP	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species	Refer to clearance.	Larry Greenwood	10-30-05
NP	Wastes (hazardous or solid)	None known or anticipated. May be affect if development takes place and special stips would take care of any problems	Stan Adams	10/20/05
NC	Water Quality (drinking/ground)	Existing NEPA documentation adequately addresses water quality.	Phil Zieg	10/29/05
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones	Resource impacts have not changed from those analyzed in the original NEPA document.	Larry Greenwood	10-30-05
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers	There are no rivers which have been designated as a Wild and Scenic River. There are no rivers which have been found to be either eligible or suitable for possible designation as a Wild and Scenic River.	Tim Finger	10/19/05
NC	Wilderness	There are no lands which have been designated as Wilderness present. There are no lands which are under study by Congress for possible designation as Wilderness.	Tim Finger	10/19/05
OTHER RESOURCES / CONCERNS				
NC	Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines	No change, there will be no impact to RHS and guidelines from this action.	Chris Colton	10/19/05
NC	Livestock Grazing	Existing NEPA documentation is adequate to cover impacts to livestock grazing.	Chris Colton	10/19/05
NC	Woodland / Forestry	Leasing will not impact Woodland/Forestry therefore No Change is expected from the existing NEPA.	Chris Colton	10/19/05
NC	Vegetation	There is no change in impacts or significance to vegetation than already addressed in the existing NEPA.	Chris Colton	10/19/05
NC	Fish and Wildlife	Resource impacts have not changed from those analyzed in the original NEPA document.	Larry Greenwood	10-30-05

Det ermi-nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
NP	Sensitive Plant & Animal Species		Larry Greenwood	10-30-05
NC	Soils	Soils are adequately addressed in the water, soils, and vegetation sections of the existing O&G EA's.	Brant Hallows	10/28/05
NC	Recreation	Leasing the lands would not alter any recreation use patterns, seasons of use, or types of use. There would be no impacts to the current recreation opportunities or experiences. Although use levels and types have changed substantially since the existing NEPA documentation was done, the analysis is still appropriate.	Tim Finger	10/20/05
NC	Visual Resources	The lands are managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class IV. The management objectives for this class are to provide for activities which require major modifications to the existing landscape character. The level of change can be high and may dominate the view. The leasing of these lands, and any resulting activity, would not exceed these objectives. The existing NEPA analysis is appropriate.	Tim Finger	10/20/05
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/En ergy Production	The existing EAs adequately addresses the impacts of oil and gas leasing, as the EAs address oil and gas operations and the impacts that could result from exploration through development. Other recorded or authorized mineral-related uses could be present on some proposed parcels, and any conflicts between oil and gas operations and other mineral operations would be resolved at the time of any application related to oil and gas exploration and development. Oil and gas exploration could lead to an increased understanding of stratigraphy and structure, which would be a benefit to minerals as well as for other uses.	Michael Jackson	10/27/05
NC	Paleontology	Impacts to paleontological resources are not anticipated. At the time of applications for exploration or development, if paleontological resources are present, then appropriate mitigations would be considered.	Michael Jackson	10/27/05
NC	Lands / Access	The existing environmental documents do not specifically address impacts to lands/realty. However, the documents do discuss the construction of pipelines, powerlines, roads, etc.and impacts resulting from these actions. If located off-lease, these facilities would be authorized by right-of-way grant. Therefore, impacts on lands/realty are indirectly discussed. Also, any existing lands/realty authorizations would be afforded protection because any oil and gas lease, which may be issued, would be subject to valid existing rights.	Gary Hall	10/20/05
NI	Fuels / Fire Management	There would be no impact due to the lease however when exploration and drilling are applied for fire/fuels management will need to be addressed. Fire/fuels management were not addressed in previous NEPA.	Russ Ivie	11/15/05
NC	Socio-economics	Socio-economic conditions are adequately addressed in the existing NEPA record.	Michael Jackson	10/27/05
NP	Wild Horses and Burros	Wild horses and burros are not present in the vicinity of the proposed parcels.	Dona Rees	11/15/05
NC	Wilderness characteristics	A portion of Parcel UT0206-011 (T 29 S., R 1 E., Section 1) is overlapped by lands which have been evaluated by BLM and which "may have" wilderness characteristics. See attached Staff Report for additional details. Although the land may have wilderness characteristics, this consideration is not part of a	Tim Finger	10/19/05

Det ermi-nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination	Signature	Date
		preferred alternative in the Richfield FO land use planning. Under the current land use plan, the parcel is open leasing, subject to standard lease terms. The other parcels have no wilderness characteristics present.		
NI	Migratory Birds	Migratory birds were not addressed in the original documents. However, leasing land would have no affect, positively or negatively, on migratory bird species.	Larry Greenwood	10-30-05

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
NEPA / Environmental Coordinator	Rodney P. Lee	11-17-05	
Authorized Officer	Wayne A. Wetzel	17 Nov 2005	

Addendum
Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and Documentation of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Utah Bureau of Land Management

This worksheet is to be completed consistent with guidance provided in instructional text boxes on the worksheet and the 'Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet' located at the end of the worksheet. The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

This addendum is supplemental to the DNA signed on November 17, 2005, by the Associate Field Manager, Richfield Field Office. Under Section D (NEPA Adequacy Criteria), Criterion 3 is revised to reflect a recommendation for a determination of No Historic Properties Affected for cultural resources in accordance with Section VII.C.4 of the State Protocol Agreement. This recommendation is based upon a Staff Report, Cultural Resources (revised 12/05/2005). The original Staff Report (October 21, 2005) is replaced by the revised report, and the revised report is attached to this addendum.

This addendum does not change the determination of NEPA adequacy and plan conformance that was recommended in the original DNA, signed on November 17, 2005.

Cornell Christensen, Field Manager

Date 12/19/05

Attachment: Staff Report, Cultural Resources, February 2006 Oil & Gas Lease Parcels, October 21, 2005 (revised 12/05/2005)