

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

October 26, 2005



Documentation of LUP Conformance and
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
UT-020-2006-007

February, 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Sale

Location: Summit County. T. 1 N., R. 5 E., Section 10, N $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$
Section 12, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$; Section 14, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$,
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$; Section 26, N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$; Section 24, E $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$,
S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$; and Section 34, N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

Applicant/Address: Utah State Office - BLM

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Salt Lake Field Office
2370 South 2300 West
Salt Lake City, 84119
Phone: (801) 977-4300
FAX: (801) 977-4397

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

Project Title: February, 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Sale

NEPA Log Number: UT-020-2006-007

File/Serial Number: NA

Project Leader: Mike Ford

Date Proposal Received: 10/24/05

Plan Decision/Objective: Refer to B in DNA.

Date of Public Notification: 10/24/05

STAFF REVIEW OF PROPOSAL:

NP/NI/PI NC	Resource	Date Reviewed	Assignment/Initials	Review Comments
NC	Wilderness/ Wilderness Characteristics, Recreation and Visual Resources.		Mandy Rigby	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid), Paleontology and Geology / Mineral Resources.		Mike Ford	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.
NC	Air Quality, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Environmental Justice, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Lands / Access, Fuels / Fire Management and Socio-Economics.		Pam Schuller	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Species, Fish and Wildlife including Special Status Species, and Water Quality (drinking/ground).		Randy Swilling	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.
NC	Cultural Resources and Native American Religious Concerns.		Lori Hunsaker	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.
NC	Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Floodplains, Invasive/Non-Native Species, Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines, Livestock Grazing, Soils, Wild Horses and Burros, Woodland / Forestry, Wetlands/Riparian Zones and Vegetation/SSP.		Mike Gates	As presented in Items B and C of the DNA.

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Date	Signature	Comments
Environmental Coordinator			ENBB notices are attached.
Manager			

(UT-023)
3100
1791

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

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. Proposed Action Title/Type: February, 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Sale

Location of Proposed Action: T. 1 N., R. 5 E., Section 10, N $\frac{1}{2}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 12, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$; Section 14, N $\frac{1}{2}$ N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$; Section 26, N $\frac{1}{2}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$; Section 24, E $\frac{1}{2}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, SW $\frac{1}{4}$; and Section 34, N $\frac{1}{2}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

Description of the Proposed Action: The Bureau of Land Management proposes to lease 2 parcels of public land comprising a total area of 3,280 acres for oil and gas leasing in a competitive lease sale to be held in February, 2006. The analysis area is illustrated on the attached map M:\Projects\all_users\mford\avprojects\February 2006 Oil & Gas Lease Sale Map.pdf. Both parcels are located on split-estate lands where the lands are private surface/federal minerals administered by the Salt Lake Field Office. The 2 parcels proposed for leasing are located within Summit County, Utah (Attachment 1).

A portion of the lands within Parcels UT 0206-001 and UT 0206-002 would be offered as Oil and Gas Category 2 leases, open for leasing with special stipulations. A lease may be held for 10 years, after which the lease would expire unless oil or gas are produced in paying quantities. A producing lease would be held indefinitely by paying production.

For Category 2 leases, a lessee's right to explore and drill for oil and gas at some location on the lease is implied by issuance of the lease. A lessee must submit an application for permit to drill (APD) to the BLM for approval and must possess a BLM approved APD prior to drilling. Following BLM's approval of an APD, a lessee may produce oil and gas from a lease without additional approval.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

Salt Lake District Oil & Gas EA	Date Approved 1975
Bear River East Plan Amendment EA	Date Approved 1994

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

The Bear River East Plan Amendment EA (Cache, Davis, Morgan, Rich, Summit, Wasatch, Weber Counties) (9-94) specifically identifies 330,723 acres in the area as being open for leasing with special stipulations. These documents identify 102,139 acres as open for leasing under standard stipulations. The specific locations of the special stipulations are shown on Master Title Plats on file at the Field Office and the BLM Utah State Office.

C. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Refer to item "B", above for a list by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report): Salt Lake District Office Riparian Strategic Plan (1989); Management Guidelines for Greater Sage Grouse and Sagebrush-Steppe Ecosystems (2000); Utah's Non-Point Source Pollution Management Plan (2000); Utah's 303(d) List of Water (2002) and Utah's Standards and Guidelines for Healthy Rangelands (1997).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

Yes, the proposed action of leasing for oil and gas exploration and development is essentially the same action analyzed in the Salt Lake District Oil & Gas EA and the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA. The proposed action analyzed in those documents is to lease federal minerals within the district. The associated Master Title Plats identify the locations of the parcels proposed for oil and gas leasing, exploration and development under Oil and Gas Category 2, Special Stipulations.

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, and resource values?

Yes, the range of alternatives in the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA is appropriate. A No Leasing Alternative was considered in the Salt Lake District O&G EA and reviewed in the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA. Analysis of this range of alternatives would respond to any concerns and interests and provides an alternative for protection of any resource values that may be affected by the current proposal. Issues, concerns, interests and resource values identified and analyzed in the above documents are discussed in Sections D.3 and D.5.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Yes, the description of the affected environment in the Salt Lake District O&G EA and the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA describe the resource values that could be affected by the proposed leasing. Important habitat values are found on Parcels UT 0206-001 and UT 0206-002. Under Water Quality, there are no water bodies within or near any of the parcels that are on Utah's 303(d) List of Waters (2002). Designated use (i.e. secondary recreation, aquatic wildlife, coldwater fish, agriculture) would not be interfered with.

Wastes or substances would not be created or deposited. Based on the soil types and mitigation, turbidity coliforms or pH would not be affected. Metals (arsenic, barium, cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, mercury, selenium or silver), inorganics (boron, fluoride, nitrates or Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), radiological components (radon, strontium or tritium), and herbicides/insecticides would not be introduced/released. Numeric criteria for total dissolved gases, minimum dissolved oxygen, pH, turbidity would not be exceeded or impacted.

Based on a review of the two subject parcels, oil and gas leasing is not likely to effect or has no potential for impacts to resource/places of concern to other Native American tribes at this time. The proposed parcels are not within the jurisdiction of Native American trust lands. There is no potential to affect places or religious or traditional concern to native tribes for the remaining parcels at this time. There is no potential to affect historic properties through this action. Also, additional consultation would be conducted for Section 106, Native American tribes, and possibly other groups prior to the approval of Applications for Permit to Drill (APD's). Since publication of the relevant NEPA documents, environmental justice, ground water quality, Native American trust assets, and noxious weeds have been added to the list of critical elements of the human environment. No minority or low income groups would be affected by disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects. Issues considered for the relevant NEPA documents included, among others, wildlife habitat, riparian, T&E species, sage grouse and visual resources.

Both of the subject parcels are within areas that meet water quality standards for the State identified beneficial uses [Utah's 303(d) List of Waters (2002)]. Under standard stipulations or conditions of approval, noxious and invasive weeds would be addressed and mitigated. After review of the applicable Land Use Plans, as amended (see B; Land Use Conformance section of this DNA), and potential lynx habitat, it is concluded that no Federally listed threatened, endangered or candidate species, or its critical habitat, occur in the action area; there will be "No Effect" on species protected under the Endangered Species Act. Under Utah State Office Instruction Memorandum UT 2003-027, related to subject Utah BLM State Sensitive plant and animal species list, provisions under the existing Land Use Plans, as amended, have provided stipulations to ensure minimal effects on those sensitive species listed. Implementing operating conditions and construction standards provided in the Salt Lake Oil & Gas EA, 1975, as necessary, to address acceptable noise levels, restriction of human activities, timing of exploration or other concerns would ensure protection of wildlife habitat and resource concerns.

An Interdisciplinary Team reviewed the subject proposal and determined that the environmental analysis for the remaining lands to be offered is adequate. Refer to the Interdisciplinary Analysis Record Checklist.

Several relevant NEPA and/or planning documents were reviewed in order to determine the adequacy of previous environmental analysis relevant to current wildlife issues and concerns. The Bear River East Plan Amendment EA portrayed and analyzed relevant decisions and in a programmatic manner that included consideration of threatened and endangered species, and candidate species. This document also relates specific protections to other important wildlife habitat values which include BLM's ability to restrict disturbing activities (including seismic and oil and gas exploration and development) in crucial deer summer, winter and fawning ranges, crucial elk winter ranges, waterfowl areas, raptor nesting sites, sage grouse lek, brood and winter habitats, riparian areas, bighorn lambing areas, antelope fawning areas, and bald eagle roost sites.

NEPA analysis is provided in the Bear River East Supplemental Oil and Gas Environmental Assessment (EA UT-020-91-32). Numerous wildlife issues and concerns were addressed in a manner similar to those for other RMP's within the Salt Lake Field Office area. Wildlife protective measures that were analyzed include both seasonal and spatial restrictions with the following: protection of bald eagle habitat/nesting/roosting areas, protection of crucial seasonal wildlife habitats, protection of sage grouse breeding, brooding and winter habitats, no surface occupancy of white tailed prairie dogs colonies, no surface disturbance within 600 feet of surface waters.

Recent directives, including Washington Office Instruction Memorandum WO 2002-174, have been issued that clarify existing oil and gas lease stipulation policy and provide new guidance in regard use of stipulations and notices for threatened, endangered, and other special status species. The stipulation communicates BLM's retained authority to modify or deny lease activities pursuant to nondiscretionary statutes. Thus BLM would require specific lease stipulations on oil and gas leases where these species or their habitat is known or strongly suspected. This stipulation will be attached to all offered leases in the Utah February, 2006 sale. The stipulation would allow modifications to existing management decisions relating to threatened, endangered or special status species as found necessary during any subsequent environmental analysis.

Previous NEPA and planning did consider potential affects to water quality and quantity in some manner. Analysis suggests that reasonable foreseeable developments would have such a negligible surface impact that no adverse impacts would be expected on a watershed basis. Protection of live water sources is also specifically in effect including activity off sets from water sources.

In addition to the water quality and source protections mentioned above, modern standard operating procedures and best management practices are designed to virtually preclude adverse impacts to water quality. Such mitigation is usually applied at the Application Permit to Drill stage that requires further site specific NEPA analysis.

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

Yes, the methodology and approach used in the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA are appropriate for the current proposed action because the methods of extraction, land requirements for exploration and development, and potential impacts have not changed substantially since 1994. The basic analysis assumptions included in the document are still applicable to the current proposal as detailed in the response to Questions D.5 and D.6 below.

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

Yes, the Salt Lake District O&G EA, Supplemental Oil & Gas EA's, and Bear River East Plan Amendment EA analyze the potential impacts from oil and gas leasing on the subject lands. Reasonably foreseeable impacts were analyzed on the basis of a reasonably foreseeable level of exploration and development, taking into account the known and inferred potential for occurrence and discovery of producible quantities of hydrocarbons.

Lands within the Salt Lake Field Office are categorized so that the Federal mineral estate will be in the least restrictive category which would adequately protect the resources. Areas containing the most valuable, rare, and/or unique resource values were placed in more restrictive categories, where conflicts could be mitigated by using special stipulations and/or allowing no surface occupancy.

To date, only 1 exploration well has been drilled within lands covered by the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA (in the Bridger Lake area) since its preparation in 1994. One additional APD has been approved for a well proposed to be drilled during the summer of 2006 in the Table Top area of Summit County (North Slope of the Uinta Mountains). Total disturbance is within the analyzed scenario. Because the proposed action is essentially the same (see the answer to D.1) and the existing resource conditions and values (Affected Environment) have not changed (D.3), the potential direct and indirect environmental impacts of the current lease proposal are substantially unchanged from those addressed in the Plan Amendment. Briefly summarized, impacts analyzed in that Plan Amendment included temporary impacts on big game habitat, sage grouse habitat, raptor sites and riparian areas.

The Bear River East Plan Amendment EA included analysis of a varied program of leasing and no leasing in the study area as follows:

- Category 1 – 102,139 acres open to leasing with standard stipulations
- Category 2 - 330,723 acres open to leasing subject to standard and special stipulations
- Category 3 - 530 acres open to leasing subject to no surface occupancy
- Category 4 - 0 acres closed to leasing

The stipulations identified and associated with the proposed lease parcel list were keyed to specific areas, and were designed to protect sensitive resources including air quality, water resources, soils, wildlife, threatened and endangered species, visual resources, and recreational resources. These areas were compiled on Master Title Plats located at the Field Office. The analysis is therefore site-specific and allows specific location and identification of potential impacts of the current leasing proposal.

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

Yes, as discussed in D.5, the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA addressed reasonably foreseeable impacts based on a reasonably foreseeable level of oil and gas activity through the year 2005. As stated in that EA, leasing levels and leasing activities are expected to remain at the same level unless significant oil and gas finds are made. Since the date of those documents, no significant oil and gas finds have been made. Because the level of impacts described in the subject EA has not yet been attained, the reasonably foreseeable level of oil and gas activities that were analyzed are still appropriate (D.5). Additional connected, cumulative, or similar actions are not anticipated because potential cumulative impacts are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the Salt Lake District O&G EA and the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA.

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

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review procedures and findings made through the development of the Bear River East Plan Amendment EA are adequate for the proposed lease sale. This DNA was placed on the Electronic Notification Bulletin Board and SLFO Lobby on October 24, 2005. No issues have been brought forward at this time, including wild horses, or WSA/other wilderness concerns.

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

Name	Title
Michael Ford	Geologist and Team Lead
Randy Swilling	Wildlife Biologist
Lori Hunsaker	Archaeologist
Mike Nelson	Realty Specialist
Mandy Rigby	Recreation Planner, Wilderness Coordinator
Mike Gates	Rangeland Management Specialist
Pam Schuller	Environmental Specialist

F. Mitigation Measures: Refer to lease stipulations.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that:

Plan Conformance:

- This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plans.
- 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.

Environmental Specialist

Date

Michael G. Nelson

Michael G. Nelson
Acting Assistant Field Office Manager,
Non-Renewable Resources

11-15-05

Date

Attachments:

Preliminary Oil and Gas Parcels; February, 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Sale
Analysis Area Map