UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Farmington District
Farmington Field Office
6251 N College Blvd., Ste. A
Farmington, NM 87402

DECISION RECORD

for the

Lybrook D32-2306 01H
Lybrook I30-2306 01H

NEPA No. DOI-BLM-NM-2014-0024
ATS-F010-13-388 & ATS-F010-13-287

I. Decision

I have decided to select the **proposed actions** for implementation as described in the **Lybrook D32-2306 #1H and Lybrook I30-2306 #1H**. Based on my review of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and project record, I have concluded that the **proposed actions** were analyzed in sufficient detail to allow me to make an informed decision. I have selected these alternatives because the proposed **project would allow Encana O&G (USA) access to their proposed drilling sites in order to horizontally drill for oil and gas within their valid existing lease without topographical issues and minimal cultural issues that have been mitigated.**

II. Conformance and Compliance

The proposed action is in conformance with the 2003 BLM-FFO Resource Management Plan (RMP). Pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.28 and 1502.21, this site-specific Environmental Assessment (EA) tiers into and incorporates by reference the information and analysis contained in the BLM-FFO Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS) (BLM 2003a). The RMP was approved by the September 29, 2003 Record of Decision (ROD) (BLM 2003b), and updated in December 2003.

It is the policy of the BLM to make mineral resources available for disposal and to encourage development of mineral resources to meet national, regional, and local needs, consistent with national objectives of an adequate supply of minerals at reasonable market prices. At the same time, the BLM strives to ensure that mineral development is carried out in a manner that minimizes environmental damage and provides for the rehabilitation of affected lands. (BLM 2003b, 2-2 – 2-3)

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

I have reviewed the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed activities documented in the EA for the **Lybrook D32-2306 #1H and Lybrook I30-2306 #1H**. I have also reviewed the project record for this analysis. The effects of the proposed action and alternatives are disclosed in the Alternatives and Environmental Consequences sections of the EA. I have determined that **construction of two single well pads, two access roads, and two subsurface well-tie pipelines to allow Encana O&G (USA) reasonable access to the mineral lease in order to develop the existing lease** as described in the EA will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, I have determined that the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary.

IV. Other Alternatives Considered

Several configurations of the proposed well pads, pipelines, and roads were considered and evaluated by the applicant, BLM, and natural and cultural resources experts using desktop tools and in-field examination. Two preliminary locations were identified but eliminated given the potential to impact cultural resources. A third preliminary location was identified but also eliminated because it would not have been technically feasible to drill and because of the presence of jurisdictional waters of the United States.

Encana proposed the Lybrook L29-2306 (1935 FSL and 282 FWL) that was evaluated by the BLM and applicant in January 2013. This location was eliminated because portions of the pad were staked in ephemeral drainages and stormwater flowing from the sandstone mesa to the south onto the pad would be difficult to manage. The pad size could not be decreased nor could the pad be shifted to avoid impacting drainageways. The L29-2306 was then relocated (2009 FSL and 164 FWL) and evaluated in June 2013 by the BLM and applicant. This second location would have required rounding one corner significantly to avoid impact to cultural resources and a drainage flowing down the working side. The drainage would have required armoring and additional design features to protect the pad from erosion. Additionally, the access road to the location would have required a 60-inch culvert. The proposed Lybrook I30-2306 location was then developed and is presented as part of the proposed action.

Encana proposed the M29-2306 location that was evaluated by the BLM in June 2013. This pad was located on a lower terrace of Sisnathyl Mesa and would have required over 19 feet of fill over sandstone along one side of the pad. Given these topographical impacts, this location was eliminated from detailed consideration and the Lybrook D32-2306 was developed and is presented as part of the proposed action. The initial proposed access road for the Lybrook D32-2306 would have crossed two relatively large ephemeral drainages. During the planning process, the route was modified to avoid these drainages and to follow an existing two-track road.

No other alternatives were identified that would create less disturbance and still achieve the purpose and need of the proposed action.

V. Rationale for the Decision

Pursuant to 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1508.28 and 1502.21, this EA incorporates the information and analysis contained in the 2003 Farmington Proposed Resource Management Plan (PRMP)/Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (USDI/BLM 2003a). The proposed action would be in conformance with the oil and gas leasing and development management actions in the Resource Management Plan (RMP)/Record of Decision (ROD) signed December 2003 and updated in December 2003 (USDI/BLM 2003b). The proposed action would be in conformance with the 2003 RMP/ROD that states, to the extent possible, new ROWs will be located within or parallel to existing ROWs or corridors to minimize resource impacts (USDI/BLM 2003b, page 2-11). The PRMP/FEIS and ROD are available for review at the Farmington Field Office, 6251 College Boulevard Suite A, Farmington, New Mexico, or electronically at http://www.nm.blm.gov/ffo/ffo_home.html.

I have determined that the activities described in the proposed action will not adversely affect or cause loss or destruction of scientific, cultural, or historical resources, including those listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)). Cultural resource surveys were completed for each location (BLM report Number 2014 (I) 005 F and BLM report Number 2014 (I) 008 F). Cultural resources were identified near the project areas. BLM report Number 2014 (I) 005 F is possibly within the Sisnathyel Mesa traditional cultural property but is not within a cultural ACEC; therefore, the cultural site will be protected for the duration of the project through employee education and site barrier fences. BLM report Number 2014 (I) 008 F is not within a traditional cultural property or within a cultural ACEC; however, since cultural resources have been identified the cultural site will be protected for the duration of the project through employee education, onsite monitoring during construction, and site barrier fences.

The proposed activities are not likely to adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)). The project area is not within any Threaten and Endangered habitat, but is located within a Sensitive habitat for the Bract's cactus that is part of the new BLM interim guidance area. No Bract's cacti were found on either well pad or access road locations; therefore, no further guidance is needed.

VI. Public Involvement

The Notice of Staking was made available for the public to review at the Farmington Field Office. No comments were received. The project was posted on the Farmington Field Office NEPA log. No comments were received.

VII. Administrative Review and Appeal

Under Chapter 3 of BLM regulations, this Decision Record (DR) is subject to administrative review in accordance with 43 CFR 3165. Any request for administrative review of this DR, with or without oral presentation, must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, 301 Dinosaur Trail, Santa Fe, NM 87508, no later than 20 business days after this DR is received or considered to have been received.

Any party who is adversely affected by the State Director's decision may appeal that decision to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, as provided in 43 CFR 3165.4.

__/S/ Maureen Joe_____ __12/13/13_____
Maureen Joe Date
Assistant Field Manager
Farmington Field Office