

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

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Utah Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

---

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:** Fillmore Field Office (UT-010)

**Proposed Action Title:** November, 2006 competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale

**Location of Proposed Action:** Parcels within Juab and Millard County, Utah. Attachment 2 contains legal descriptions for each parcel.

**Description of the Proposed Action:**

The Utah State Office of the Bureau of Land Management has received nominations to offer lands for oil and gas leasing in a competitive lease sale to be held November 21, 2006. Sixteen parcels of land, totaling 32,026.90 acres, in Juab and Millard Counties, Utah are within the administrative area of the Fillmore Field Office (FFO). The proposed leasing of these sixteen (16) parcels is assessed in this document for land use plan compliance and NEPA adequacy. Thirteen (13) parcels are located in Juab County, Utah and three (3) parcels are located in Millard County, Utah. The sixteen parcels are listed in Attachment 2. These parcels include public lands or lands in which the mineral estate is administered by the BLM. Parcels of land that are not purchased for lease at the sale by competitive bidding may be leased within two years after the initial offering under this review of NEPA adequacy.

A lease may be held for ten years (43 CFR 3120.2-1), after which the lease would expire unless oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. A producing lease would be held indefinitely by paying production of oil or gas.

An Application for Permit to Drill (APD) (Form 3160-3) must be submitted to the BLM for approval and the approved APD must be in possession prior to any surface disturbance in preparation for drilling. Compliance with lease stipulations must be demonstrated prior to the approval of an APD. Following BLM approval of an APD, production of oil and gas from the well may proceed in a manner approved by BLM in the APD or in subsequent sundry notices. The operator must notify the appropriate authorized officer, 48 hours before starting any surface disturbing activity approved in the APD.

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

House Range Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision Rangeland Program Summary (RMP/ROD), Date Approved: October 28, 1987, and

Warm Springs Resource Area Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision Rangeland Program Summary (RMP/ROD), Date approved: March 23, 1987.

Planning decisions place certain lands in a no leasing category (Category 4). Some lands are leased with minor stipulations attached to the lease from the appropriate land use plan for the area (Category 2). Some lands are leased with limited areas of no surface occupancy within the lease boundaries (Category 3). Some lands are

leased with no stipulations other than those found on the standard lease contract form (Category 1). A lease grants the right to drill for oil and gas, at some location on the lease.

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

The House Range Resource Area HRRARMP (10/87) specifically identifies the entire planning area as being open for leasing with standard stipulations in Decision D.3, page 76 of the HRRARMP, except for 30,780 acres designated as Category 2 lands; 54,740 acres as Category 3 lands; and 58,990 acres as Category 4 lands. These categories and acreages were later revised in the 1988 Implementation EA.

The Warm Springs Resource Area WSRARMP (3/87) specifically identifies the entire planning area as being open for leasing with standard stipulations on page 47 of the WSRARMP, except for 64,570 acres designated as Category 2 lands and 25,727 acres as Category 3 lands. These categories and acreages were later revised in the 1988 Implementation EA.

The Oil and Gas Category plats of the HRRARMP and the WSRARMP identify the stipulations to be attached to each lease or portion thereof.

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

Environmental Analysis Record (EAR), Oil & Gas Leasing, (Old) Fillmore District, Bureau of Land Management, Richfield District, May 06, 1976;

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Resource Management Plan for the House Range Resource Area (HRRAEIS), August 1986/September 1986;

House Range Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Leasing Implementation Environmental Assessment (HRRAOGEA), Richfield District, December 21, 1988;

Final Environmental Impact Statement and Proposed Resource Management Plan for the Warm Springs Resource Area (WSRAEIS), September 1986; and

Warm Springs Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Leasing Implementation Environmental Assessment (WSRAOGEA), Richfield District, December 21, 1988.

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

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

Yes.

The HRRARMP, WSRARMP, HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA include categorization of lands within the planning unit pertaining to oil and gas leasing. Category 1 lands are available for lease with standard lease stipulations. Category 2 lands are available for lease, subject to special stipulations dependent on the specific area. Category 3 lands are available for lease subject to a no surface occupancy stipulation. Category 4 lands are unavailable for lease of oil and gas. Areas within wilderness study areas are not offered for lease. The WSRAOGEA, identifies 2,136,458 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 1, 64,570 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 2, and 25,727 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 3. The HRRAOGEA, identifies

2,112,594 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 1, 34,454 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 2, and 75,592 acres as Fluid Mineral Leasing Category 3.

The action for Category 1, as analyzed in the WSRAOGEA and HRRAOGEA, is to lease the Category 1 lands for oil and gas exploration and development subject to standard lease stipulations (Page 8, Table 2-11, WSRAOGEA and Page 12, Table 2-29, HRRAOGEA). All the lands of parcels UT1106-033, UT1106-068, UT1106-082, and UT1106-095 through UT1106-104 are Category 1. Portions of parcels UT1106-081 and UT1106-083 are also identified as Category 1 lands. The lands of parcel UT1106-038 are identified as Category 2 and are subject to time frame restrictions for development. Portions of parcels UT1106-038, UT1106-081, and UT1106-083 are identified as Category 3 and are subject to a no surface occupancy stipulation.

**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.

The HRRAEIS, Summary, page 1, paragraph “Alternative A: No Action” and page 5, paragraph “Alternative C” proposed no new special land use designations within the Resource Area. These alternatives proposed no change in the lands available for oil and gas lease under standard lease stipulations, nor any change in lands withdrawn from oil and gas lease (Categories 1 and 4 lands respectively). Alternatives “A” and “C”, also did not propose any change in lands available for oil and gas lease with special lease stipulations nor lands with surface occupancy restrictions (Categories 2 and 3 respectively). Alternative “B”, Summary, page 1, paragraph “Alternative B” as incorporated in the preferred alternative “D”, Summary, page 5, paragraph “Alternative D” proposed no change in the lands designated as Category 2 lands. However, the HRRAOGEA increased the area designated as Category 2 lands from 30,780 acres to 34,454 acres. Alternatives “B” and “D” increased the area designated as Category 3 lands from 22,490 acres to 54,740 acres (increased further in the HRRAOGEA to 75,592 acres). These alternatives proposed that the Category 4 designated lands be reduced from 59,190 acres to 58,990 acres (decreased further in the HRRAOGEA to 21,394 acres).

The Draft Warm Springs Resource Area Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS) is referenced by the WSRAEIS, Chapter 3: Alternatives. Alternative “A”, Draft EIS, Chapter 2: Alternatives, page 41, table 2-3 and Alternative “C”, Draft EIS, page 52, paragraph: “Oil, Gas, and Geothermal” proposed no new oil and gas leasing category designations within the Resource Area. These alternatives proposed no change in the lands available for oil and gas lease under standard lease stipulations, nor any change in lands withdrawn from oil and gas lease (Categories 1, and 4 lands respectively). Alternatives “A” and “C”, also did not propose any change in lands available for oil and gas lease with special lease stipulations nor lands with surface occupancy restrictions (Categories 2 and 3 lands respectively). The Draft EIS, Chapter 2: Alternatives, page 48, table 2-7: Oil and Gas Leasing Categories Under Alternative B, shows an increase of the acreage of Category 2 lands from 6,321 to 112,097 and the acreage of Category 3 lands from 26,840 to 45,447. Category 4 acreage would have remained the same. The Draft EIS, Chapter 2: Alternatives, table 2-10: Oil and Gas Leasing Categories under Alternative D, the preferred alternative, proposed increasing the acreage of Category 2 from 6,321 to 55,670; decreasing the acreage of Category 3 lands from 26,840 to 25,727; and decreasing the acreage of Category 4 lands from 24,167 to zero. However, the WSRAEIS increased the area designated as Category 2 lands from 55,670 acres to 64,570 acres.

The “No Action Alternative” in the HRRAEIS is described as “existing management practices at current levels and intensities.” The “No Action Alternative” included by reference to the Draft EIS in the WSRAEIS is described as “current direction and level of management intensity and levels of resources uses.” The EAR, page 11, Alternatives to the Proposed Action, considers a no leasing alternative for oil and gas resources in the district.

Analysis of this range of alternatives responds to concerns and interests and provides an alternative for protection of any resource values that may need protection by the current proposal. Issues, concerns, interests and resource values identified and analyzed in the WSRARMP, HRRARMP, and the related NEPA documents identified in Section C of this DNA, and their relevance to the proposed leasing, are discussed in Section D.3 and D.5.

**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 U.S. 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?**

**Item 3: Yes for the following parcels:**

*(\* indicates that a portion of this parcel is deferred)*

<b>UT1106-038</b>	<b>UT1106-082</b>	<b>UT1106-096</b>	<b>UT1106-099</b>	<b>UT1106-102</b>
<b>UT1106-068</b>	<b>UT1106-083</b>	<b>UT1106-097</b>	<b>UT1106-100</b>	<b>UT1106-103</b>
<b>UT1106-081</b>	<b>UT1106-095</b>	<b>UT1106-098</b>	<b>UT1106-101</b>	<b>UT1106-104</b>

Pages 13 through 94 of the HRRARMP and pages 9 through 62 of the WSRARMP describe the resource values that could be affected by the proposed leasing. Conflicts with oil and gas leasing usually occur when there is considerable area within a parcel that cannot be explored without causing significant impact to one or more resources. Resources scrutinized when determining oil and gas categories during preparation of the HRRARMP and WSRARMP were: Air Quality; Range Management, Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines, Vegetation, Soils; Wildlife; Wild Horses, Recreation; Cultural Resources; Lands; Minerals; Watershed; Forest Resources; Socio-economics; and Fire Management. Since the HRRARMP and WSRARMP were prepared impacts to the following resources and critical elements are also analyzed: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Environmental Justice; Prime or Unique Farmlands; Floodplains; Invasive Non-native Species; Native American Religious Concerns; Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Species of Plants and Animals; Hazardous or Solid Wastes; Wetlands/Riparian Zones; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Wilderness/Wilderness Study Areas; Wilderness Characteristics; Visual Resources; Energy Resources; Water Rights; and Fire Prevention/Preparedness. These resources have been analyzed through the ID Team Checklist in Attachment 3. The ID team review finding is that existing NEPA documents adequately analyze the potential impacts on lands within the parcels recommended for leasing.

Cultural resource information concerning the proposed parcels has been analyzed based on an assessment of soils, elevation, topography, vegetation and water resources in the un-surveyed parcels compared to similar areas where surveys have been conducted. Based on the results of previous cultural resource inventories, the potential for locating additional cultural resources within the lease parcels reviewed for the November 2006 oil and gas lease sale is moderate to low. Furthermore, analysis of the impacts of leasing on potentially eligible cultural resources has resulted in the recommendation of “No Historic Properties Affected; eligible sites present but not affected as defined by 36CFR800.4.” based on the determination that reasonable development could occur on each parcel without impact to eligible properties. A brief summary and analysis of inventories within the parcels can be found in the attached specialist report of the FFO archeologist in Attachment 4.

All the lease parcels offered in the FFO are known to be frequented by Bald Eagles and are historic Pigmy Rabbit habitat. Lease development would account for proper protection of these species.

Drilling for oil and gas resources would be done away from existing water facilities and wells would be properly cased in order to protect water quality and water rights. Wetlands and riparian vegetation would be avoided during development.

Activities performed under the lease are subject to valid existing rights.

Parcels UT1106-068, UT1106-081 through UT1106-083, and UT1106-095 through UT1106-104 are within the Utah Test and Training Range and subject to coordination with the U.S. Air Force (USAF).

All areas disturbed during lease development would be contoured covered with growth medium and seeded; existing roads would be used to the extent possible.

Concerns with Water Quality, Wetlands/Riparian, Lands/Realty, Vegetation, and Water Rights are addressed and mitigated through Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3 lease stipulations and standard operating procedures required through the Application for Permit to Drill approval process, as well as, the following notices and stipulations that will apply to the specific parcels listed.

Parcel UT1106-038 would contain the following stipulation:

In order to protect wildlife exploration, drilling, and other development activity in the parcel will be allowed only during the period from May 15 to December 15. This limitation does not apply to maintenance and operation of producing wells. Exceptions to this limitation in any year may be specifically approved in writing by the authorized officer of the Bureau of Land Management.

Parcels UT1106-068, UT1106-081 through UT1106-083, and UT1106-095 through UT1106-104 would contain the following stipulation:

All or portions of this parcel are within the Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR) Military Operations Area or Restricted Area. Prior to approval or any operations on the lease The 388<sup>th</sup> Range Squadron Security Office, Hill Air Force Base (801-777-3242) must be contacted for coordination concerning the following requirements:

#### Military Operations Area (MOA)

- 1) The MOA air space starts at 100 ft. above ground surface. No towers or rigs may be installed in excess of 100 ft. above ground level (AGL) without UTTR coordination.
- 2) No permanent construction above 500 AGL is allowed.
- 3) Lease sites may not be permanently manned.
- 4) There can be no limitations on current Chaff (100 ft. AGL) and Flares (2,000 ft. AGL).
- 5) No electronic counter measures (ECM) conflicts/limitations would be allowed. A total frequency review will be required to ensure there is no conflict.
- 6) No noise limitations are allowed.
- 7) No permanent construction above 500' AGL is allowed
- 8) No live weapon overflight limitations will be permitted.
- 9) The military will not be liable for wildfire damage.

#### Restricted Airspace

- 1) *Restricted Airspace starts at the surface. In addition to the above noted requirements, No towers or rigs will be allowed in excess of 100 ft. AGL without UTTR approval. Any aerial operations require UTTR scheduling.*

Cultural Resources, Threatened, Endangered and Critical Species (animals) and Wildlife concerns will result in all lease parcels having the following notices attached:

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 lessee/operator is given notice that this lease parcel has been identified as containing threatened or endangered species or habitat. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in order to protect threatened or endangered species and/or habitat from surface disturbing activities in accordance with the Endangered Species Act and its section 7 consultation procedures.

The lessee/operator is given notice that lands in this lease have been identified as containing Bald Eagle Habitat. Modifications to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in order to protect Bald Eagle and/or habitat from surface disturbing activities in accordance with Section 6 of the lease terms, Endangered Species Act, and 43 CFR 3101.1-2.

The lessee/operator is given notice that lands in this parcel have been identified as containing habitat for Pigmy Rabbit, which is on the Utah Sensitive Species List. Modification to the Surface Use Plan of Operations may be required in order to protect these resources from surface disturbing activities in accordance with Section 6 of the lease terms, Endangered Species Act, and 43 CFR 2101.1-2. This notice may be waived, accepted, or modified by the authorized officer if either the resource values change or the lessee/operator demonstrates that adverse impacts can be mitigated.

**Item 3: No for the following parcels:**

*(\* indicates that portions of that parcel were recommended for lease sale)*

**UT1106-033**

**Item 3: Rationale for “No”:** See Deferred Parcel Table in Attachment 5.

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

**Item 4: Yes for the following parcels:**

*(\* indicates that a portion of this parcel is deferred)*

<b>UT1106-033</b>	<b>UT1106-082</b>	<b>UT1106-096</b>	<b>UT1106-099</b>	<b>UT1106-102</b>
<b>UT1106-038</b>	<b>UT1106-083</b>	<b>UT1106-097</b>	<b>UT1106-100</b>	<b>UT1106-103</b>
<b>UT1106-068</b>	<b>UT1106-095</b>	<b>UT1106-098</b>	<b>UT1106-101</b>	<b>UT1106-104</b>
<b>UT1106-081</b>				

**Item 4: Rationale for “Yes”:** Because the methods of extraction, land requirements for exploration and development and potential impacts have not changed substantially since 1988. The basic analysis assumptions included in the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA are still applicable to the current proposal as detailed in the response to Questions D.5 and D.6 below.

**Item 4: No for the following parcels:**

None

**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)?**

**Item 5: Yes** for the following parcels:

UT1106-033	UT1106-082	UT1106-096	UT1106-099	UT1106-102
UT1106-038	UT1106-083	UT1106-097	UT1106-100	UT1106-103
UT1106-068	UT1106-095	UT1106-098	UT1106-101	UT1106-104
UT1106-081				

**Item 5: Rationale for “Yes”:** The HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA analyze the potential impacts from oil and gas leasing in the resource areas (HRRAOGEA, pages 2 and 3 and WSRAOGEA, pages 2 and 3). Reasonable foreseeable impacts of exploration and development were analyzed, taking into account the known and inferred potential for occurrence and discovery of producible quantities of hydrocarbons. Oil and gas development in either resource area is not anticipated. The potential for the occurrence of producible quantities of oil and gas appears to be low. Historically about one exploration well is drilled every two years and there are no wells producing oil or gas in either resource area. The analyses in the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA were based on the drilling of one exploration well every two years. This would total five exploration wells over a ten year planning horizon in each resource area. The average oil and gas exploration well disturbs one acre. When two miles of access road are included, the total disturbance, per well, is six acres. Therefore, the total disturbance from oil and gas activity for the ten-year planning period would be about thirty acres in each resource area, including access requirements.

Since preparation of the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA, two oil and gas exploration wells have been drilled in the House Range Resource Area (HRRA), and two have been drilled in the Warm Springs Resource Area (WSRA). Three other APDs were approved in the HRRA, but the sites were never drilled. No economic quantities of hydrocarbons have been demonstrated. The total disturbance in each planning unit from the two drilled wells totals approximately four acres, well 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 (see the answer to D.3), the potential direct and indirect environmental impacts of the current lease proposal are substantially unchanged from those addressed in the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA.

The proposed parcels being offered in the Fillmore Field Office area are within Category 1, Category 2, and Category 3 lands. Potential impacts on Category 1 lands can be mitigated through the standard oil and gas lease stipulations; Category 2 lands can be mitigated through special lease stipulations outlined in table 2-11, pages 7 and 8 of the HRRRAEA and table 2-29 pages 4 and 5 of the WSRAEA. Category 3 lands leased with a no surface occupancy stipulation. The HRRARMP, pages 2 through 5 and Map 9, the WSRARMP pages 1 through 4 and Map 8, the HRRAOGEA Maps 1 through 38, and Maps 1 through 20 of the WSRAOGEA provide site-specific information regarding the location of sensitive resources and potential impacts. The analysis of the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA are therefore site-specific and allows specific location and identification of potential impacts of the current leasing proposal.

**Item 5: No** for the following parcels:

None

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

**Item 6: Yes for the following parcels:**

UT1106-033	UT1106-082	UT1106-096	UT1106-099	UT1106-102
UT1106-038	UT1106-083	UT1106-097	UT1106-100	UT1106-103
UT1106-068	UT1106-095	UT1106-098	UT1106-101	UT1106-104
UT1106-081				

**Item 6: Rationale for “Yes”:** As discussed in the answer to question D.5, the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA addressed reasonably foreseeable impacts based on an anticipated level of oil and gas activity. The analyses in the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA were based on the drilling of one exploration well every two years. This would total five exploration wells over a ten year planning horizon in each resource area. The average oil and gas exploration well disturbs one acre. When two miles of access road are included, the total disturbance, per well, is six acres. Therefore, the total disturbance from oil and gas activity for the ten-year planning period would be about thirty acres in each resource area, including access requirements.

Since preparation of the HRRAOGEA and WSRAOGEA, two oil and gas exploration wells have been drilled in the House Range Resource Area (HRRRA), and two have been drilled in the Warm Springs Resource Area (WSRA). Three other APDs were approved in the HRRRA, but the sites were never drilled. No economic quantities of hydrocarbons have been demonstrated. The total disturbance in each planning unit from the two drilled wells totals approximately four acres, well within the analyzed scenario.

The potential collective and cumulative impacts of oil and gas leasing as analyzed on pages 2 and 3 of the HRRAOGEA and pages 2 and 3 of the WSRAOGEA are not substantially different for this proposal.

**Item 6: No for the following parcels:**

None

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

**Item 7: Yes for the following parcels:**

UT1106-033	UT1106-082	UT1106-096	UT1106-099	UT1106-102
UT1106-038	UT1106-083	UT1106-097	UT1106-100	UT1106-103
UT1106-068	UT1106-095	UT1106-098	UT1106-101	UT1106-104
UT1106-081				

**Item 7: Rationale for “Yes”:** During the development of the HRRARMP in 1980 through 1987, public workshops and meetings were held in Nephi, Ibapah, and Fillmore, Utah. Federal Register (FR) Notices concerning the preparation and availability of the HRRARMP were posted February 22, 1980, May 1, 1985 and September 1986. Public comment on the oil and gas categories was received in 1986 and all comments were responded to in the HRRAEIS.

During the development of the WSRARMP public meetings were held in Fillmore, Utah on February 15, 1983 and May 12, 1986. Federal Register (FR) Notices concerning the preparation and availability of the WSRARMP were posted February 27, 1983, May, 1985, April 3, 1986 and April 17, 1986. Public comment on the oil and gas categories was received in 1986 and all comments were responded to in the WSRAEIS.

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) regarding this action occurred by letter dated September 14, 2006. In that letter a description of the concerns with wildlife and threatened and endangered

species was described along with the notices proposed to be attached to any leases being issued. Consultation will be considered complete if FWS response presents no objection of if response is not received by October 18, 2006.

The following tribes were notified via certified letter sent on August 15, 2006 regarding this project: Paiute Tribe of Utah (PITU), Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation, Kanosh Band of the Paiute Tribe, Skull Valley Goshute Tribe and the Ute Tribe. They were asked to identify traditional cultural places or any other areas of traditional cultural importance that needs to be considered within the Area of Potential Effect. Based on the information received, the BLM has determined that the May 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Offering has no potential to affect tribes or Traditional Cultural Properties. The Utah State Historic Preservation Office was also consulted with regarding this project and concurs with the BLM determination of No Historic Properties Affected. Additional consultation will be conducted should site-specific use authorization requests for a lease be received.

**Item 7: No for the following parcels:**

None

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** The interdisciplinary team is identified on the attached Interdisciplinary Team Checklist.

**F. Mitigation Measures:** Mitigation measures in the form of lease notices and stipulations for specific lease parcels are listed in question D.3.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Plan Conformance and Determination of NEPA Adequacy**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that the following parcels conform with the existing land use plans and have adequate NEPA (the asterisk (\*) after the parcels indicates that portions of that parcel are recommended for deferral):

<b>UT1106-038</b>	<b>UT1106-082</b>	<b>UT1106-096</b>	<b>UT1106-099</b>	<b>UT1106-102</b>
<b>UT1106-068</b>	<b>UT1106-083</b>	<b>UT1106-097</b>	<b>UT1106-100</b>	<b>UT1106-103</b>
<b>UT1106-081</b>	<b>UT1106-095</b>	<b>UT1106-098</b>	<b>UT1106-101</b>	<b>UT1106-104</b>

Based on new information regarding relevant and important resources within the following parcels (or portions thereof) the current land use plan guidance no longer provides adequate protection of those resources and therefore no longer conform to the current land use plan (the asterisk (\*) after the parcels indicates that portions of that parcel are recommended for lease sale):

**UT1106-033**

          /s/ Sherry K. Hirst            
**Signature of the Responsible Official**

          10/4/2006            
**Date**