DECISION RECORD
Documentation of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2013-0032DNA
Lease Parcel Review August 2013

INTRODUCTION: It is the policy of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as derived from various laws, including the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, to make mineral resources available for disposal and to encourage development of mineral resources to meet national, regional, and local needs.

The BLM’s Colorado State Office conducts quarterly competitive lease sales to sell available oil and gas lease parcels. A Documentation of NEPA Adequacy, DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2013-0032DNA, was prepared to ensure that the impacts of leasing parcels nominated with the Little Snake Field Office in the August 2013 lease sale were analyzed.

The proposed action is to lease, for potential oil and gas exploration and production, approximately 2125.44 acres of federal mineral estate within the Little Snake Field Office area. The US Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and private landowners manage the surface estate; the mineral estate in the proposed project area is administered by the BLM. Three (3) parcels of varying sizes are proposed to be included in the upcoming August 2013 Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale.

The three parcels were included in the proposed action for the February 2013 environmental assessment (EA), DOI-BLM-CO-N010-2012-0049 EA. Prior to the release of the decision record (DR), these three parcels were deferred from leasing pending further review and analysis. As part of the Little Snake Field Office (LSFO) review, the parcels were reviewed to make sure the appropriate stipulations would be attached at the time of the lease sale.

PROPOSED DECISION:
It is my decision to implement the proposed action as identified in the Little Snake Field Office DNA DOI-BLMCO-N010-2013-0032, in which three (3) lease parcels will be offered for lease in the August 2013 competitive lease sale.

RATIONALE FOR DECISION:
The decision to approve the proposed action is based upon the following: 1) consistency with the approved resource management plan; 2) national policy; 3) agency statutory requirements; 4) relevant resource and economic issues; 5) application of measures to avoid or minimize environmental impacts.

1. This decision is in conformance with the LSFO RMP (October 2011).
2. It is the policy of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) as derived from various laws, including the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended [30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.] and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, to make mineral resources available for disposal and to encourage development of mineral resources to meet national, regional, and local needs.
3. The decision is consistent with all federal, state, and county authorizing actions required for implementation of the Proposed Action.
4. Economic benefits derived from implementation of the proposed action considered important and have been analyzed in the EA.

5. Standard terms and conditions as well as special stipulations would apply. Lease stipulations (as required by Title 43 Code of Federal Registration 3131.3) were added to each parcel as identified by the LSFO to address site specific concerns or new information not identified in the land use planning process.

AUTHORITIES:
The authority for this decision is contained in 43 CFR 3100.

PLAN CONFORMANCE:
The proposed action and alternatives have been reviewed and found to be in conformance with the approved Little Snake Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (RMP) (October 2011). The oil and gas leasing decisions and associated lease stipulations can be found in Section 2.13 Energy and Minerals/ page RMP-36.


Terms / Conditions / Stipulations:
For all parcels, standard terms and conditions, as well as the lease notices and stipulations identified by parcel in Appendix C of the EA, would apply to the lease parcels.

COMPLIANCE WITH MAJOR LAWS:
The proposed decision and proposed oil and gas leases with stipulations are in compliance with all applicable law, regulations, and policies, including the following:
- Endangered Species Act
- Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- Clean Water Act
- National Historic Preservation Act
- Clean Air Act
- Etc.

MONITORING:
No monitoring would be required in the sale and issuance of the lease parcels. Should the parcels be developed, monitoring may be required and would be analyzed under future NEPA documentation.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
On May 10, 2013, the Bureau of Land Management provided notice that parcels of land would be offered in a competitive oil and gas lease sale on August 8, 2013; this lease sale notice initiated a 30-day protest period for the lease sale. The BLM received two protests from private individuals as a result of this protest period.
APPEALS:
The decision of the State Director may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4 and Form 1842-1 (copy attached). If an appeal is taken, your notice of appeal must be filed in this office (at the above address) within 30 days from your receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the Decision appealed from is in error. If you wish to file a petition (pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 316s.4(c)) for a stay of the effectiveness of this Decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. A copy of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA) and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Standards for obtaining a stay
Standards for Obtaining a Stay except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied;
2. The likelihood of the appellant’s success of the merits;
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and;
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.
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