

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

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: Price Field Office (UT-070)

Proposed Action Title: May 16, 2006 competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale

Location of Proposed Action: Parcels within Carbon and Emery County, Utah. *Appendix A* contains legal descriptions for each parcel.

Description of the Proposed Action: The Utah State Office proposes to offer 180 parcels of land in Carbon and Emery Counties, Utah administered by the Price Field Office for oil and gas leasing in a competitive lease sale to be held on May 16, 2006. All 180 parcels were assessed for land use plan compliance and NEPA adequacy. Sixty-six (66) parcels are located in Carbon County, Utah and 114 parcels are located in Emery County, Utah. *Appendix A* lists all parcels including special lease stipulations. These parcels include public lands or lands in which the mineral estate is administered by the BLM. If a parcel of land is not purchased at the lease sale by competitive bidding, it may still be leased within two years after the initial offering under a current review of NEPA adequacy. A lease may be held for ten years, after which the lease expires unless oil or gas is produced in paying quantities. A producing lease can be held indefinitely by economic production.

Planning decisions place certain lands in a no leasing category. Most lands are leased with minor stipulations attached to the lease from the appropriate land use plan for the area. Some lands are leased with limited areas of no surface occupancy within the lease boundaries. Some lands are leased with no stipulations other than those found on the standard lease contract form. A lease grants the right to drill for oil and gas, at some location on the lease.

A lessee must submit an Application for Permit to Drill (APD) (Form 3160-3) to the BLM for approval and must possess an approved APD prior to any surface disturbance in preparation for drilling. Any stipulations attached to the standard lease form must be complied before an APD may be approved. Following BLM approval of an APD, a lessee may produce oil and gas from the well 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.

Based on our review of the parcels, the Price Field Office found that all of that parcels UT0506-200 and UT0506-238 conflict with active coal leases for the West Ridge Coal Mine therefore these parcels are indefinitely deferred (see Attachment 2).

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

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

- Price River Management Framework Plan, September 2, 1983
- Price River Management Framework Plan Supplement, August 13, 1984
- San Rafael Resource Management Plan, May 24, 1991
- Range Valley Habitat Management Plan, 1991
- Range Creek Wild Horse Management Area Plan, May 9, 1994
- Nine Mile Canyon Special Recreation and Cultural Management Area Activity Plan, January 4, 1995

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

Price River Management Framework Plan (MFP) Minerals M-1: Allow and encourage development of those Leasable minerals known to occur within the planning area in accordance with current laws and regulations so as to aid in filling the local and national energy requirements.

San Rafael Resource Management Plan (RMP) (page 11): To lease public lands for oil and gas...only so long as RMP goals are met; and to administer operational aspects of federal oil and gas leases where BLM does not manage the surface.

The Oil and Gas Category plats of the Price River MFP and the San Rafael RMP 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.

- Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, August 15, 1975
- Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS, October 1984
- Price River Management Framework Plan Supplement, August 13, 1984
- EA Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Lease Categories, Price River Resource Area, December 23, 1988
- San Rafael Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement, May 24, 1991
- San Rafael Proposed Resource Management Plan, 1989 Vol. 1 and 2
- Castlegate Coalbed Methane Project Carbon County Utah, October 1992
- Price Coalbed Methane Project Final Environmental Impact Statement, May 1997
- Ferron Natural Gas Project Final Environmental Impact Statement, July 6, 1999
- Price Field Office Resource Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), July 2004 (referred to in this document as the 2004 draft RMP EIS)
- Price RMP ACEC Proposal Review Information 2003-2004
- Stone Cabin 3D Seismic Survey Project EA, March 19, 2004
- West Tavauputs Plateau Drilling Program, July 29, 2004

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Item 1: Yes for the following parcels:

UT0506-120	UT0506-165	UT0506-209	UT0506-250
UT0506-121	UT0506-166	UT0506-210	UT0506-251
UT0506-122	UT0506-167	UT0506-211	UT0506-252
UT0506-123	UT0506-168	UT0506-212	UT0506-253
UT0506-124	UT0506-169	UT0506-213	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-125	UT0506-170	UT0506-214	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-126	UT0506-171	UT0506-215	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-127	UT0506-172	UT0506-216	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-128	UT0506-173	UT0506-217	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-129	UT0506-174	UT0506-218	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-130	UT0506-175	UT0506-219	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-131	UT0506-176	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-132	UT0506-177	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-133	UT0506-178	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-134	UT0506-179	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-135	UT0506-181	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-136	UT0506-182	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-255
UT0506-137	UT0506-183	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-256
UT0506-138	UT0506-184	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-257
UT0506-139	UT0506-185	UT0506-221	UT0506-258
UT0506-140	UT0506-186	UT0506-222	UT0506-259
UT0506-142	UT0506-187	UT0506-227	UT0506-260
UT0506-143	UT0506-188	UT0506-228	UT0506-261
UT0506-144	UT0506-189	UT0506-229	UT0506-262
UT0506-145	UT0506-190	UT0506-230	UT0506-262-A
UT0506-146	UT0506-191	UT0506-231	UT0506-262-B
UT0506-147	UT0506-193	UT0506-232	UT0506-262-C
UT0506-148	UT0506-194	UT0506-233	UT0506-264
UT0506-149	UT0506-195	UT0506-234	UT0506-265
UT0506-150	UT0506-196	UT0506-235	UT0506-266
UT0506-151	UT0506-197	UT0506-236	UT0506-267
UT0506-152	UT0506-198	UT0506-237	UT0506-268
UT0506-153	UT0506-199	UT0506-238	UT0506-268-A
UT0506-154	UT0506-200	UT0506-239	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-155	UT0506-201	UT0506-240	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-156	UT0506-202	UT0506-241	UT0506-269
UT0506-157	UT0506-203	UT0506-242	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-158	UT0506-203-A	UT0506-243	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-159	UT0506-204	UT0506-244	UT0506-269-C
UT0506-160	UT0506-204-A	UT0506-245	UT0506-269-D
UT0506-161	UT0506-205	UT0506-246	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-162	UT0506-206	UT0506-247	UT0506-269-F
UT0506-163	UT0506-207	UT0506-248	UT0506-269-G
UT0506-164	UT0506-208	UT0506-249	UT0506-269-H

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT0506-269-I
UT0506-271

UT0506-271-A
UT0506-308

Item 1: Rationale for Yes: The Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, the 1988 Environmental Assessment (EA) Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Leasing Categories for Price River Resource Area analyzed the leasing of parcels for development of mineral resources. The San Rafael Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) proposed leasing for oil and gas development stating, "To lease public lands for oil and gas... only so long as RMP goals are met; and to administer operational aspects of federal oil and gas leases where BLM does not manage the surface."

The Energy Policy Act of 2005 lifted the moratorium on the leasing of tar sands. Thus several parcels within the May 2006 sale were nominated within areas with known tar sand deposits. The nominations are for leasing tar sands for conventional development of oil and gas. The methods used for the development and extraction of oil and gas from these deposits would be the same as for extraction of oil and gas in other areas of the Price Field Office Management Area.

The Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS, October 1984, considered diligent development and reasonable environmental protection of the development of tar sand units, and a decision based on these criteria was made. The analysis looked at the methods typical of the extraction of hydrocarbons from tar sand and oil shale deposits. These methods involve open pit mining and/or in situ methods such as Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage, or Cyclic Steam Stimulation. All three methods involve more surface disturbance and infrastructure than conventional oil and gas extraction methods. Leasing tar sand parcels for conventional oil and gas development is well within the actions described in existing and proposed land use management plans.

Item 1: No for the following parcels: None

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?

Item 2: Yes for the following parcels:

- | | | | |
|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| UT0506-120 | UT0506-135 | UT0506-151 | UT0506-166 |
| UT0506-121 | UT0506-136 | UT0506-152 | UT0506-167 |
| UT0506-122 | UT0506-137 | UT0506-153 | UT0506-168 |
| UT0506-123 | UT0506-138 | UT0506-154 | UT0506-169 |
| UT0506-124 | UT0506-139 | UT0506-155 | UT0506-170 |
| UT0506-125 | UT0506-140 | UT0506-156 | UT0506-171 |
| UT0506-126 | UT0506-142 | UT0506-157 | UT0506-172 |
| UT0506-127 | UT0506-143 | UT0506-158 | UT0506-173 |
| UT0506-128 | UT0506-144 | UT0506-159 | UT0506-174 |
| UT0506-129 | UT0506-145 | UT0506-160 | UT0506-175 |
| UT0506-130 | UT0506-146 | UT0506-161 | UT0506-176 |
| UT0506-131 | UT0506-147 | UT0506-162 | UT0506-177 |
| UT0506-132 | UT0506-148 | UT0506-163 | UT0506-178 |
| UT0506-133 | UT0506-149 | UT0506-164 | UT0506-179 |
| UT0506-134 | UT0506-150 | UT0506-165 | UT0506-181 |

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

UT0506-182	UT0506-211	UT0506-238	UT0506-257
UT0506-183	UT0506-212	UT0506-239	UT0506-258
UT0506-184	UT0506-213	UT0506-240	UT0506-259
UT0506-185	UT0506-214	UT0506-241	UT0506-260
UT0506-186	UT0506-215	UT0506-242	UT0506-261
UT0506-187	UT0506-216	UT0506-243	UT0506-262
UT0506-188	UT0506-217	UT0506-244	UT0506-262-A
UT0506-189	UT0506-218	UT0506-245	UT0506-262-B
UT0506-190	UT0506-219	UT0506-246	UT0506-262-C
UT0506-191	UT0506-220	UT0506-247	UT0506-264
UT0506-193	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-248	UT0506-265
UT0506-194	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-249	UT0506-266
UT0506-195	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-250	UT0506-267
UT0506-196	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-251	UT0506-268
UT0506-197	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-252	UT0506-268-A
UT0506-198	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-253	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-199	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-253-A	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-200	UT0506-221	UT0506-253-B	UT0506-269
UT0506-201	UT0506-222	UT0506-253-C	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-202	UT0506-227	UT0506-253-D	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-203	UT0506-228	UT0506-253-E	UT0506-269-C
UT0506-203-A	UT0506-229	UT0506-253-F	UT0506-269-D
UT0506-204	UT0506-230	UT0506-253-G	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-204-A	UT0506-231	UT0506-253-H	UT0506-269-F
UT0506-205	UT0506-232	UT0506-253-I	UT0506-269-G
UT0506-206	UT0506-233	UT0506-253-J	UT0506-269-H
UT0506-207	UT0506-234	UT0506-253-K	UT0506-269-I
UT0506-208	UT0506-235	UT0506-253-L	UT0506-271
UT0506-209	UT0506-236	UT0506-255	UT0506-308
UT0506-210	UT0506-237	UT0506-256	

Item 2: Rationale for Yes: The range of alternatives in the Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, 1984 Price River Resource Area Management Framework Plan Supplement, the EA Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Lease Categories, Price River Resource Area, December 23, 1988, and the San Rafael RMP EIS are appropriate. In the 1975 District Oil and gas EA, BLM evaluated leasing and one alternative, to not allow leasing. The Decision Record of the 1984 Price River Resource Area Management Framework Plan Supplement states that alternatives were considered throughout the document including no action, open to leasing, leasing with special stipulations, no surface occupancy and no leasing. The San Rafael EIS analyzed the impacts of oil and gas leasing on all the lands in the San Rafael Resource Area under seven alternatives which ranged from maximum oil and gas development to reduced production in favor of other resource values.

Item 2:

No for the following parcels: None

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

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:

UT0506-120	UT0506-163	UT0506-205	UT0506-241
UT0506-121	UT0506-164*	UT0506-206	UT0506-242
UT0506-122	UT0506-165	UT0506-207	UT0506-243
UT0506-123	UT0506-166	UT0506-208*	UT0506-244
UT0506-124	UT0506-167	UT0506-209*	UT0506-245*
UT0506-125	UT0506-168	UT0506-210*	UT0506-246*
UT0506-126	UT0506-169	UT0506-211*	UT0506-248
UT0506-127	UT0506-170	UT0506-212*	UT0506-249
UT0506-128	UT0506-171	UT0506-213*	UT0506-250
UT0506-130	UT0506-172	UT0506-214*	UT0506-251
UT0506-131	UT0506-174	UT0506-215*	UT0506-252
UT0506-132	UT0506-176	UT0506-216	UT0506-253
UT0506-133	UT0506-177	UT0506-217	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-134	UT0506-178	UT0506-218	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-135	UT0506-179	UT0506-219	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-136	UT0506-181	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-137	UT0506-182	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-142	UT0506-183	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-143	UT0506-184	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-144	UT0506-185*	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-145*	UT0506-186	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-146	UT0506-187*	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-148	UT0506-188	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-149	UT0506-189*	UT0506-221	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-150	UT0506-190*	UT0506-222	UT0506-259
UT0506-151	UT0506-191	UT0506-227*	UT0506-261
UT0506-152	UT0506-194*	UT0506-228*	UT0506-262
UT0506-153	UT0506-196	UT0506-231	UT0506-262-A*
UT0506-154	UT0506-197	UT0506-232	UT0506-262-B*
UT0506-155	UT0506-198	UT0506-233	UT0506-262-C*
UT0506-156	UT0506-199	UT0506-234	UT0506-269-C*
UT0506-157	UT0506-201	UT0506-235	UT0506-269-D*
UT0506-158	UT0506-202	UT0506-236	UT0506-269-F*
UT0506-159	UT0506-203	UT0506-237*	UT0506-269-G*
UT0506-160*	UT0506-203A	UT0506-238	UT0506-269-H*
UT0506-161	UT0506-204	UT0506-239	UT0506-269-I*
UT0506-162	UT0506-204A	UT0506-240	UT0506-308

Item 3: Rationale for "Yes": The Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, the EA Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Lease Categories, Price River Resource Area, December 23, 1988, and the San Rafael RMP Final EIS describe the resource values that could be affected by the proposed leasing. Since the publication of these NEPA

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

documents, environmental justice, ground water quality, Native American Religious Concerns, and noxious weeds have been added to the list of critical elements of the human environment.

Environmental Justice: The ethnic composition and economic situation of residents of Carbon and Emery Counties indicates that there are no minority or low-income populations are experiencing disproportionately high or adverse effects from current management actions (2004 Draft RMP EIS, pg 3-62). Leasing would not adversely or disproportionately affect minority, low income or disadvantaged groups.

Groundwater: Ground water quality for the land proposed for lease was analyzed in the original planning documents. Usable water zones would be isolated and protected under current regulations and Onshore Orders when permits are submitted and considered for approval.

Invasive, Non-native Species : Noxious weed introduction is limited by standard operating procedures and best management practices used as conditions of approval for surface use authorizations. These practices include, equipment washing, inspections and treatments to limit the spread or introduction of invasive, not-native species.

Native American Religious Concerns: On January 27, 2006 certified consultation letters (attached to the cultural staff report in Attachment 4) were sent to the following Tribes: Southern Ute, Navajo, Shoshone-Wyoming, Hopi, Goshute, Zuni, Uintah and Ouray Ute, Ute Mountain Ute, Northwestern Band of the Shoshone, Shoshone-Bannock, and Paiute. The letters requested comments to be provided to the PFO within 30 days upon receipt of the letter. As of February 22, 2006, only one response was received from the Paiute Tribe. This letter states that the material they received from us had been reviewed, but at this time they are not aware of any archaeological resources in or near the proposed areas. It also states that their interest is not limited to cultural resources but includes plants and animals. This letter is included in with the staff report in Attachment 4. No concerns pertaining to leasing of the preliminary parcels have been received. If any concerns are raised by the tribes, those concerns will be addressed. Consultation will be considered complete if tribal response presents no objections or if response is not received within 30 business days after the last letter was received. On March 16, 2006, follow-up consultation was completed with the Navajo, Ute, Paiute, and Hopi for parcels 203A, 268A, 268B, 268C, and 271A which were inadvertently omitted from the original letters that were sent out on January 27, 2006. (See Attachment 4) The Ute and Paiute did not have any concerns. The Hopi were contacted on 3 different occasions and a message was left with Terry Morgart. As of March 29, 2006, PFO has not received a response back from the Hopi tribe. The Navajo requested further information concerning the additional parcels, which was provided. No concerns have been communicated to PFO as of March 29, 2006.

Cultural Resources: The Area of Potential Effect for the May 2006 Oil and Gas Lease Sale is identified as the parcels offered for the lease sale, which are listed with their legal description in Attachment 3. The All parcels within this lease sale were reviewed for the presence of cultural resources. Most of the previous inventories are over twenty years old and were made at a different standard than today. Additional sites are expected to exist that were not recorded. The existing inventories and others surrounding these parcels are sufficient to determine that historic properties are likely to be present on each proposed lease parcel. Site specific analysis would be conducted at the Application for Permit to Drill stage where the presence of cultural resources would be confirmed and measures to protect these resources would be defined in the Conditions of Approval.

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

It is submitted that this oil and gas lease undertaking falls under the purview of the Protocol negotiated between BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Office, a document designed to assist BLM in meeting its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, various implementing regulations, and the National Cultural Programmatic Agreement. Further, the view taken here is that the undertaking does not exceed any of the review thresholds listed in Part VII (A) of the Protocol, and that it may be viewed as a No Historic Properties Affected; eligible sites present, but not affected as defined by 36CFR800.4 [VII (A) C (4)]. The determination was based on a conclusion that at least one well could be located on each parcel without adversely affecting cultural properties. Separate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office was completed for parcels 271-A since this parcel is not included within the Protocol Agreement. On March 22, 2006, a response letter was received from SHPO concurring with the finding of "no adverse effect" (Attachment 4).

To assure appropriate consideration of future effects from the May 16, 2006 lease sale, the BLM will add the following "lease stipulation" (WO-IM-2005-003), to all parcels offered for lease.

"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."(WO-IM 2005-03).

Special Status Species: Habitat evaluations were conducted for special status species. Parcels containing potential habitat are identified in reports contained in Attachment 4. The Price Field Office determined that the proposed action "may affect, but not likely adversely affect" the Uinta Basin hookless cactus, San Rafael Cactus, Wright fishhook cactus, Last Chance Townsendia, bald eagle, Mexican spotted owl, black footed ferret, and four endangered Colorado River fish (Bonytail chub, Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub and razorback sucker). The Price Field Office also determined that the leasing action "may affect, but not likely adversely affect" designated critical habitat for the Mexican spotted owl, Bonytail chub, Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub and razorback sucker.

Coordination letters requesting U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurrence on BLM's "not likely to adversely affect" determination were sent on December 12, 2005 and February 15, 2006. E-mail supplements to the coordination letters were sent on March 16, 2006 and March 29, 2006. FWS responses were submitted on March 3, 2006 and March 17, 2006. An additional response for seven parcels is still pending. Those seven parcels contain potential Bald eagle and Mexican spotted owl habitat, and are nearby parcels in this lease sale that FWS provided concurrence with BLM's determination. FWS concurrence is anticipated for the seven parcels, but if any issues are raised by FWS, the parcels would be pulled from the sale pending resolution. Detailed information and copies of BLM determinations and concurrence are contained in Attachment 4.

There are several sensitive animal species/habitat that may occur within, or in proximity of parcels offered for sale, including northern goshawk, ferruginous hawk, white-tailed prairie dog, greater sage grouse wintering grounds, burrowing owl, bluehead sucker, flannelmouth sucker,

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

roundtail chub, and Colorado River cutthroat trout. Application of lease stipulations, notices best management practices and approval conditions would afford protection for these species for any surface use activities. Additionally, a stipulation for protection of special status species is added to all parcels

Wilderness Characteristics: BLM's Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2003-275-Change 1 addresses the issue of wilderness characteristics in land use plans. The IM defines wilderness characteristics as features of the land associated with the concept of wilderness. The IM then describes these features as naturalness, and outstanding opportunities for solitude and/or primitive and unconfined recreation. According to the IM:

"Lands and resources exhibit a high degree of naturalness when affected primarily by the forces of nature and where the imprint of human activity is substantially unnoticeable. BLM has authority to inventory, assess, and/or monitor the attributes of the lands and resources on public lands, which, taken together, are an indication of an area's naturalness. These attributes may include the presence or absence of roads and trails, fences and other improvements; the nature and extent of landscape modifications; the presence of native vegetation communities; and the connectivity of habitats."

Table 1 identifies non WSA lands with wilderness characteristics where parcels are being offered in the May sale. These areas were inventoried and found to have wilderness characteristics by BLM in the 1999 Utah Wilderness Inventory.

Table 1

Area	Parcel(s)
Desolation Canyon	UT-243, UT-244, UT-248, UT-249, UT-253
Price River	UT-163, UT-164*, UT-165, UT-166, UT-167, UT-168, UT-169, UT-170, UT-171, UT-174, UT-177; UT-184, UT-186, UT-188, UT-204A, UT-205, UT-206, UT-207, UT-216, UT-217
Labyrinth Canyon	UT-269F*, UT-269H*, UT-269I*
Cedar Mountain	UT-128
Muddy Creek/Crack Canyon	UT-124, UT-125, UT-126, UT-127; UT-130, UT-131, UT-132, UT-133, UT-134, UT-135, UT-136, UT-137

** Indicates parcel partially deferred*

Table 2 identifies non WSA lands likely to possess wilderness characteristics where parcels are being offered in the May sale. A BLM interdisciplinary team reviewed these areas and determined there was a reasonable probability that these areas have wilderness characteristics.

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

Table 2

Area	Parcel(s)
Lost Spring Wash	UT-150, UT-151, UT-152, UT-249, UT-253
San Rafael River	UT-220A, UT-220B, UT-220C, UT-220D, UT-220E, UT-220F, UT-220G; UT-253A, UT-253B, UT-253C, UT-253D, UT-253E, UT-253F, UT-253H, UT-253I, UT-253J, UT-253K, UT-253L, UT-269F*, UT-269I*
Sweetwater Reef	UT-253K, UT-253L
Flattops	UT-222

* Indicates parcel partially deferred

Table 3 identifies public lands within a citizen wilderness proposal where parcels are being offered in the May sale. BLM has not reviewed these areas to determine if there is a reasonable probability that these areas have wilderness characteristics.

Table 3

Area	Parcel(s)
Price River	UT-215*, UT-216, UT-217, UT-218, UT-219, UT-220, UT-246*

* Indicates parcel partially deferred

Although inventory data and resource specialist determinations have indicated that this is new information in BLM inventoried areas and areas with a reasonable probability of wilderness characteristics, it is not significant from a NEPA standpoint for the following reasons: BLM has adequately considered the characteristics that make up wilderness characteristics in these existing NEPA documents.

- Price Field Office Draft RMP
- San Rafael Resource Area Proposed RMP Vol. 1 and Vol. 2 (1989)
- San Rafael Resource Area RMP/ROD (1991)
- Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record (1975)

These NEPA documents may not have specifically addressed *wilderness characteristics* in the analysis but impacts to natural character were addressed in the identification of likely disturbance related to reasonable foreseeable development and impacts to the soils and flora and fauna of the resource area. Impacts to recreation opportunities were addressed in the existing NEPA record, including impacts to primitive types of recreation to the degree that they were occurring. There has been no significant change in focus of recreation use of the areas.

The Price River Management Framework Plan (1982) is not a NEPA document, but the document is developed from the environmental analysis from other NEPA documents such as the Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record (1975). The Price River MFP also provides some analysis in regards to Visual Resource Management. In Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-275, Change 1, visual resources was identified as being a component of naturalness. While VRM is primarily concerned with scenic quality, one aspect of VRM is the description of what degree of change would be allowed to the basic landscape elements. By the classification of public lands into the five VRM classes BLM does provide a degree of analysis on naturalness through the assessment on the amount of contrast that would result from a proposed activity on the landscape.

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

There is no Bureau policy to protect wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs or designated wilderness, except as directed in an existing land use plan.

Potential ACECs: The Price Field Office evaluated public nominations for areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) as part of an ongoing planning effort. The FO determined that several areas do in fact have relevant and important values that make them potential ACECs for further consideration in the ongoing Price RMP revision. It is BLM policy to protect the relevant and important values of each potential ACEC until planning can be completed and the decision made as to whether or not to formally designate the areas as ACECs.

Several parcels nominated in the May 2006 oil and gas lease sale are located within the potential ACECs described below. An evaluation was completed for each area to determine 1) whether the relevant and important values had been adequately addressed in existing NEPA documentation and 2) whether or not the values could be protected pending completion of ongoing planning, considering application of current prescriptions, stipulations and notices, best management practices, standard operation procedures and site specific approval conditions for proposed surface disturbing activities.

Potential Mussentuchitt Badlands ACEC

Parcels UT0506-120, UT0506-121, UT0506-122, UT0506-123, UT0506-124, UT0506-125, UT0506-126, UT0506-127, UT0506-129, UT0506-130, UT0506-131, UT0506-133, UT0506-134, UT0506-135, UT0506-136 are located within the potential Mussentuchitt Badlands ACEC (69,130 acres). The relevant and important values for the potential ACEC include cultural, fossil and unique geologic values. Although this determination is new information made subsequent to the San Rafael RMP, it is not significant new information from a NEPA standpoint because leasing and subsequent development would not impact cultural, fossil and unique geologic resources to a significant manner or degree not already considered in the existing San Rafael RMP/EIS.

The Potential Mussentuchitt Badlands ACEC is located in the very southwestern corner of Emery County. Located within this potential ACEC is the Last Chance natural gas field, which includes several shut-in gas wells that are located on existing leases. These wells are considered productive and are located within a high potential natural gas resource area. Although the potential for development in the area is high, BLM has the ability to strictly control the surface use through the application of 1) special cultural resource surface use stipulations and lease notices; 2) paleontological resource lease-notices and; 3) the use of the 200-meter rule at the time of Application for Permit to Drill. Through the application of these stipulations and lease notices the relevant and important resource values should be adequately protected; thus the potential for ACEC designation in the ongoing plan would not be precluded.

Potential Temple-Cottonwood-Dugout Wash ACEC

Parcels UT0506-220-A, UT0506-220-B, UT0506-220-C, UT0506-220-D, UT0506-220-E, UT0506-220-F, UT0506-220-G, UT0506-253-A, UT0506-253-B, UT0506-253-C, UT0506-253-D, UT0506-253-E, UT0506-253-F, UT0506-253-G, UT0506-253-H, UT0506-253-I, UT0506-253-J, UT0506-253-K, UT0506-253-L, are located within the potential Temple-Cottonwood-Dugout Wash ACEC (72,604 Acres). Cultural values in the form of early to middle archaic sites located under the shifting sand dunes in the area make up the relevant and important resources for

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

the ACEC. Although this determination is new information subsequent to the San Rafael RMP, it is not significant new information from a NEPA standpoint because leasing and subsequent development would not impact cultural resources to a significant manner or degree not already considered in the existing San Rafael RMP/EIS.

The Price Mineral Potential Report dated August 2002 identifies this area as having a high potential to produce conventional oil and gas; therefore, the likelihood for development is high. However, the BLM has the ability to strictly control the surface use through the application of special cultural resource surface use stipulations, lease notices and the use of the 200-meter rule at the time of Application for Permit to Drill to adequately protect the relevant and important resource values; thus the potential for ACEC designation in the ongoing plan would not be precluded.

Grassy Trail Portion of the Potential Rock Art ACEC

Parcels UT0506-208 and UT0506-210 are located within the Grassy Trail portion of the potential Rock Art ACEC. The relevant and important resources of this 80-acre area are prehistoric cultural resource sites. Although this determination is new information subsequent to the San Rafael RMP, it is not significant new information from a NEPA standpoint because leasing and subsequent development would not impact cultural resources in a significant manner or degree not already considered in the existing San Rafael RMP/EIS.

The Price Mineral Potential Report dated August 2002 identifies this area as having a high potential to produce conventional oil and gas; therefore, the likelihood for development is high. However, the BLM has the ability to strictly control the surface use through the application of special cultural resource surface use stipulations and lease notices to the lease, and the use of the 200-meter rule at the time of Application for Permit to Drill to adequately protect the relevant and important resource values identified for the potential Grassy Trail ACEC. Thus, the potential for ACEC designation in the ongoing plan would not be precluded.

Item 3: No for the following parcels:

UT0506-138	UT0506-208*	UT0506-247	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-139	UT0506-209*	UT0506-255	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-140	UT0506-210*	UT0506-256	UT0506-269
UT0506-147	UT0506-211*	UT0506-257	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-164*	UT0506-212*	UT0506-258	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-173	UT0506-213*	UT0506-260	UT0506-269-C*
UT0506-175	UT0506-214*	UT0506-262-A*	UT0506-269-D*
UT0506-185*	UT0506-215*	UT0506-262-B*	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-187*	UT0506-227*	UT0506-262-C*	UT0506-269-F*
UT0506-189*	UT0506-228*	UT0506-264	UT0506-269-G*
UT0506-190*	UT0506-229	UT0506-265	UT0506-269-H*
UT0506-191*	UT0506-230	UT0506-266	UT0506-269-I*
UT0506-193	UT0506-237*	UT0506-267	UT0506-271
UT0506-194*	UT0506-245*	UT0506-268	UT0506-271-A
UT0506-195	UT0506-246*	UT0506-268-A	

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

Item 3: Rationale for "Yes": See Deferred Parcel Table in Attachment 2.

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:

UT0506-120	UT0506-162	UT0506-204	UT0506-241
UT0506-121	UT0506-163	UT0506-204-A	UT0506-242
UT0506-122	UT0506-164	UT0506-205	UT0506-243
UT0506-123	UT0506-165	UT0506-206	UT0506-244
UT0506-124	UT0506-166	UT0506-207	UT0506-245
UT0506-125	UT0506-167	UT0506-208	UT0506-246
UT0506-126	UT0506-168	UT0506-209	UT0506-247
UT0506-127	UT0506-169	UT0506-210	UT0506-248
UT0506-128	UT0506-170	UT0506-211	UT0506-249
UT0506-129	UT0506-171	UT0506-212	UT0506-250
UT0506-130	UT0506-172	UT0506-213	UT0506-251
UT0506-131	UT0506-173	UT0506-214	UT0506-252
UT0506-132	UT0506-174	UT0506-215	UT0506-253
UT0506-133	UT0506-175	UT0506-216	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-134	UT0506-176	UT0506-217	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-135	UT0506-177	UT0506-218	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-136	UT0506-178	UT0506-219	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-137	UT0506-179	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-138	UT0506-181	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-139	UT0506-182	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-140	UT0506-183	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-142	UT0506-184	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-143	UT0506-185	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-144	UT0506-186	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-145	UT0506-187	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-146	UT0506-188	UT0506-221	UT0506-255
UT0506-147	UT0506-189	UT0506-222	UT0506-256
UT0506-148	UT0506-190	UT0506-227	UT0506-257
UT0506-149	UT0506-191	UT0506-228	UT0506-258
UT0506-150	UT0506-193	UT0506-229	UT0506-259
UT0506-151	UT0506-194	UT0506-230	UT0506-260
UT0506-152	UT0506-195	UT0506-231	UT0506-261
UT0506-153	UT0506-196	UT0506-232	UT0506-262
UT0506-154	UT0506-197	UT0506-233	UT0506-262-A
UT0506-155	UT0506-198	UT0506-234	UT0506-262-B
UT0506-156	UT0506-199	UT0506-235	UT0506-262-C
UT0506-157	UT0506-200	UT0506-236	UT0506-264
UT0506-158	UT0506-201	UT0506-237	UT0506-265
UT0506-159	UT0506-202	UT0506-238	UT0506-266
UT0506-160	UT0506-203	UT0506-239	UT0506-267
UT0506-161	UT0506-203-A	UT0506-240	UT0506-268

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT0506-268-A
UT0506-268-B
UT0506-268-C
UT0506-269

UT0506-269-A
UT0506-269-B
UT0506-269-C
UT0506-269-D

UT0506-269-E
UT0506-269-F
UT0506-269-G
UT0506-269-H

UT0506-269-I
UT0506-271
UT0506-308

Item 4: Rationale for "Yes": The methodology and approach used in the Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, the 1984 and 1988 EA Supplements, the Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS and the San Rafael RMP Final EIS 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 completion of these documents. The basic analysis assumptions included in these documents are still applicable to the current proposal. Coal bed methane production in Utah is essentially the same as conventional gas development as water production is injected below surface, therefore the methods of extraction, land requirements for exploration and development and potential impacts have not substantially changed.

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:

UT0506-120
UT0506-121
UT0506-122
UT0506-123
UT0506-124
UT0506-125
UT0506-126
UT0506-127
UT0506-128
UT0506-129
UT0506-130
UT0506-131
UT0506-132
UT0506-133
UT0506-134
UT0506-135
UT0506-136
UT0506-137
UT0506-138
UT0506-139
UT0506-140
UT0506-142
UT0506-143

UT0506-144
UT0506-145
UT0506-146
UT0506-147
UT0506-148
UT0506-149
UT0506-150
UT0506-151
UT0506-152
UT0506-153
UT0506-154
UT0506-155
UT0506-156
UT0506-157
UT0506-158
UT0506-159
UT0506-160
UT0506-161
UT0506-162
UT0506-163
UT0506-164
UT0506-165
UT0506-166

UT0506-167
UT0506-168
UT0506-169
UT0506-170
UT0506-171
UT0506-172
UT0506-173
UT0506-174
UT0506-175
UT0506-176
UT0506-177
UT0506-178
UT0506-179
UT0506-181
UT0506-182
UT0506-183
UT0506-184
UT0506-185
UT0506-186
UT0506-187
UT0506-188
UT0506-189
UT0506-190

UT0506-191
UT0506-193
UT0506-194
UT0506-195
UT0506-196
UT0506-197
UT0506-198
UT0506-199
UT0506-200
UT0506-201
UT0506-202
UT0506-203
UT0506-203-A
UT0506-204
UT0506-204-A
UT0506-205
UT0506-206
UT0506-207
UT0506-208
UT0506-209
UT0506-210
UT0506-211
UT0506-212

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

UT0506-213	UT0506-232	UT0506-253-A	UT0506-262-C
UT0506-214	UT0506-233	UT0506-253-B	UT0506-264
UT0506-215	UT0506-234	UT0506-253-C	UT0506-265
UT0506-216	UT0506-235	UT0506-253-D	UT0506-266
UT0506-217	UT0506-236	UT0506-253-E	UT0506-267
UT0506-218	UT0506-237	UT0506-253-F	UT0506-268
UT0506-219	UT0506-238	UT0506-253-G	UT0506-268-A
UT0506-220	UT0506-239	UT0506-253-H	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-220-A	UT0506-240	UT0506-253-I	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-220-B	UT0506-241	UT0506-253-J	UT0506-269
UT0506-220-C	UT0506-242	UT0506-253-K	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-220-D	UT0506-243	UT0506-253-L	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-220-E	UT0506-244	UT0506-255	UT0506-269-C
UT0506-220-F	UT0506-245	UT0506-256	UT0506-269-D
UT0506-220-G	UT0506-246	UT0506-257	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-221	UT0506-247	UT0506-258	UT0506-269-F
UT0506-222	UT0506-248	UT0506-259	UT0506-269-G
UT0506-227	UT0506-249	UT0506-260	UT0506-269-H
UT0506-228	UT0506-250	UT0506-261	UT0506-269-I
UT0506-229	UT0506-251	UT0506-262	UT0506-271
UT0506-230	UT0506-252	UT0506-262-A	UT0506-308
UT0506-231	UT0506-253	UT0506-262-B	

Item 5: Rationale for "Yes": The Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, the 1984 and 1988 EA Supplements, the Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS and San Rafael RMP Final EIS evaluated the direct and indirect impacts of oil and gas leasing per the current leasing categories, whether open to leasing, open to leasing with special stipulations or otherwise. As identified under criterion 3, no significant new information or circumstances have been identified which would render the existing analyses inadequate for leasing the above parcels. Nor have the existing resource conditions and other elements of the human environment changed substantially from those evaluated in the existing documents.

Coalbed methane production was not reasonably foreseeable when the planning documents were prepared. However, coalbed methane production in Utah is essentially the same as conventional gas development as water production is injected below surface; therefore there is no change to the existing resource conditions and values.

Oil and gas production from tar sand deposits was not reasonably foreseeable when the planning documents were prepared. However, conventional oil and gas production from tar sands is essentially the same as oil and gas development from other formations; therefore there is no change to the existing resource conditions and values.

Item 5: No for the following parcels:
None

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

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:

UT0506-120	UT0506-164	UT0506-207	UT0506-247
UT0506-121	UT0506-165	UT0506-208	UT0506-248
UT0506-122	UT0506-166	UT0506-209	UT0506-249
UT0506-123	UT0506-167	UT0506-210	UT0506-250
UT0506-124	UT0506-168	UT0506-211	UT0506-251
UT0506-125	UT0506-169	UT0506-212	UT0506-252
UT0506-126	UT0506-170	UT0506-213	UT0506-253
UT0506-127	UT0506-171	UT0506-214	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-128	UT0506-172	UT0506-215	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-129	UT0506-173	UT0506-216	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-130	UT0506-174	UT0506-217	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-131	UT0506-175	UT0506-218	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-132	UT0506-176	UT0506-219	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-133	UT0506-177	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-134	UT0506-178	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-135	UT0506-179	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-136	UT0506-181	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-137	UT0506-182	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-138	UT0506-183	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-139	UT0506-184	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-255
UT0506-140	UT0506-185	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-256
UT0506-142	UT0506-186	UT0506-221	UT0506-257
UT0506-143	UT0506-187	UT0506-222	UT0506-258
UT0506-144	UT0506-188	UT0506-227	UT0506-259
UT0506-145	UT0506-189	UT0506-228	UT0506-260
UT0506-146	UT0506-190	UT0506-229	UT0506-261
UT0506-147	UT0506-191	UT0506-230	UT0506-262
UT0506-148	UT0506-193	UT0506-231	UT0506-262-A
UT0506-149	UT0506-194	UT0506-232	UT0506-262-B
UT0506-150	UT0506-195	UT0506-233	UT0506-262-C
UT0506-151	UT0506-196	UT0506-234	UT0506-264
UT0506-152	UT0506-197	UT0506-235	UT0506-265
UT0506-153	UT0506-198	UT0506-236	UT0506-266
UT0506-154	UT0506-199	UT0506-237	UT0506-267
UT0506-155	UT0506-200	UT0506-238	UT0506-268
UT0506-156	UT0506-201	UT0506-239	UT0506-268-A
UT0506-157	UT0506-202	UT0506-240	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-158	UT0506-203	UT0506-241	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-159	UT0506-203-A	UT0506-242	UT0506-269
UT0506-160	UT0506-204	UT0506-243	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-161	UT0506-204-A	UT0506-244	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-162	UT0506-205	UT0506-245	UT0506-269-C
UT0506-163	UT0506-206	UT0506-246	UT0506-269-D

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT0506-269-E
UT0506-269-F

UT0506-269-G
UT0506-269-H

UT0506-269-I
UT0506-271

UT0506-308

Item 6: Rationale for "Yes": The cumulative impacts of oil and gas including coalbed methane development have been analyzed in Castlegate Coalbed Methane Project, Price Coalbed Methane Project, and Ferron Natural Gas Project EISs. The EISs update the development scenario addressed the 1988 EA Supplements. The Ferron Natural Gas Project EIS, the last to be completed, addressed the cumulative impacts of all three actions. Therefore the cumulative impacts of coalbed methane and conventional oil and gas activities have been analyzed in full. Coalbed methane production was not reasonably foreseeable when the planning documents were prepared. However, coalbed methane production in Utah is essentially the same as conventional gas development as water production is injected below surface; therefore there is no change to the existing resource conditions and values.

Natural gas production from tar sands is essentially the same as conventional natural gas production. Because the areas have been analyzed for surface disturbance related to conventional natural gas and coalbed methane production, the cumulative impacts have been analyzed in full.

Western portions of Carbon County, including Nine Mile Canyon are not within the cumulative impacts analysis areas evaluated for the Castlegate Coalbed Methane Project, Price Coalbed Methane Project, or Ferron Natural Gas Project EISs. Therefore, these documents did not update the analysis included in the 1988 EA Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Categories.

The 1988 EA evaluated the cumulative impacts of oil and gas leasing to supplement the Price District Oil and Gas Environmental Analysis Record, August 15, 1975, and Price River Management Framework Plan Supplement, August 13, 1984. The 1988 EA supplement projected five wells drilled per year between 1988 and 2000 within the Price River Resource Area on lands administered according to the MFP. Estimates also projected that 48 of the 60 total wells would be non-producing, abandoned and reclaimed.

The 1984 Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS of 1984 analyzed impacts of tar sands development on a regional basis and included in situ methods. This would involve more surface disturbance and infrastructure than conventional oil and gas methods.

The most recent cumulative impacts analysis, including the Stone Cabin 3D Seismic Survey Project EA completed March 19, 2004, projected at total of nine federal wells, plus five to seven wells to be drilled annually on state and private lands. The current implementation of the West Tavaputs Plateau Drilling Program, authorized July 29, 2004, consisting of development of 38 wells, exceeds this projection. Public comments on the these documents were voluminous and provided by national interests. The comments largely identified transportation and public safety in Nine Mile Canyon, concerns related to the potential ACEC and potential National Historic District, opportunities for recreational viewing of rock art, and other potential impacts to cultural resources in Nine Mile Canyon as primary issues.

The current reasonably foreseeable development scenario in the Price RMP Draft EIS projects 600 wells on the West Tavaputs Plateau. The analysis contained in the Price RMP draft EIS would allow for multiple wells from each of these locations. The acres disturbed is in line with the expected cumulative impacts on the West Tavaputs Plateau. On August 27, 2005, the Price Field Office published in the Federal Register a Notice of Intent to prepare an EIS for full field development of natural gas resources on the West Tavaputs Plateau to include up to approximately 500 pad locations and 750 individual wells.

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

The NOI for the full field development EIS also specified that development of future leases will be analyzed within the scope of that document.

Because the reasonably foreseeable level of oil and gas activity analyzed previously is still appropriate and additional connected, cumulative, or similar actions are not anticipated; potential cumulative impacts are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the EISs and RFDs.

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:

UT0506-120	UT0506-155	UT0506-190	UT0506-220-C
UT0506-121	UT0506-156	UT0506-191	UT0506-220-D
UT0506-122	UT0506-157	UT0506-193	UT0506-220-E
UT0506-123	UT0506-158	UT0506-194	UT0506-220-F
UT0506-124	UT0506-159	UT0506-195	UT0506-220-G
UT0506-125	UT0506-160	UT0506-196	UT0506-221
UT0506-126	UT0506-161	UT0506-197	UT0506-222
UT0506-127	UT0506-162	UT0506-198	UT0506-227
UT0506-128	UT0506-163	UT0506-199	UT0506-228
UT0506-129	UT0506-164	UT0506-200	UT0506-229
UT0506-130	UT0506-165	UT0506-201	UT0506-230
UT0506-131	UT0506-166	UT0506-202	UT0506-231
UT0506-132	UT0506-167	UT0506-203	UT0506-232
UT0506-133	UT0506-168	UT0506-203-A	UT0506-233
UT0506-134	UT0506-169	UT0506-204	UT0506-234
UT0506-135	UT0506-170	UT0506-204-A	UT0506-235
UT0506-136	UT0506-171	UT0506-205	UT0506-236
UT0506-137	UT0506-172	UT0506-206	UT0506-237
UT0506-138	UT0506-173	UT0506-207	UT0506-238
UT0506-139	UT0506-174	UT0506-208	UT0506-239
UT0506-140	UT0506-175	UT0506-209	UT0506-240
UT0506-142	UT0506-176	UT0506-210	UT0506-241
UT0506-143	UT0506-177	UT0506-211	UT0506-242
UT0506-144	UT0506-178	UT0506-212	UT0506-243
UT0506-145	UT0506-179	UT0506-213	UT0506-244
UT0506-146	UT0506-181	UT0506-214	UT0506-245
UT0506-147	UT0506-182	UT0506-215	UT0506-246
UT0506-148	UT0506-183	UT0506-216	UT0506-247
UT0506-149	UT0506-184	UT0506-217	UT0506-248
UT0506-150	UT0506-185	UT0506-218	UT0506-249
UT0506-151	UT0506-186	UT0506-219	UT0506-250
UT0506-152	UT0506-187	UT0506-220	UT0506-251
UT0506-153	UT0506-188	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-252
UT0506-154	UT0506-189	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253

**Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final**

UT0506-253-A	UT0506-253-L	UT0506-262-C	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-253-B	UT0506-255	UT0506-264	UT0506-269-C
UT0506-253-C	UT0506-256	UT0506-265	UT0506-269-D
UT0506-253-D	UT0506-257	UT0506-266	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-253-E	UT0506-258	UT0506-267	UT0506-269-F
UT0506-253-F	UT0506-259	UT0506-268	UT0506-269-G
UT0506-253-G	UT0506-260	UT0506-268-A	UT0506-269-H
UT0506-253-H	UT0506-261	UT0506-268-B	UT0506-269-I
UT0506-253-I	UT0506-262	UT0506-268-C	UT0506-271
UT0506-253-J	UT0506-262-A	UT0506-269	UT0506-308
UT0506-253-K	UT0506-262-B	UT0506-269-A	

Item 7: Rational for "Yes": The public involvement and interagency review procedures and findings made through the development of the Price River MFP, the Price River MFP Supplement approved August 13, 1984, and the Environmental Assessment Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Leasing Categories for the Price River Resource Area approved on December 23, 1988, the Environmental Assessment Supplement on Cumulative Impacts on Oil and Gas Leasing Categories for the San Rafael Resource Area approved on December 20, 1988, and the San Rafael Resource Management Plan approved May 24, 1991 are adequate for the proposed lease sale. A public meeting was held in Price on April 18, 1983. A Federal Register Notice concerning the preparation and availability was posted on April 27, 1983. On June 13, 1985 a Federal Register Notice announced BLM's intention to develop the San Rafael RMP, soliciting public participation in the process. A series of opportunities, though comment periods, public workshops, and similar meetings, ensured an appropriate level of public participation during the preparation of the RMP EIS between 1985 and 1991.

In February 1997, BLM conducted public and internal scoping to solicit input to identify the environmental issues and concerns associated with the proposed Ferron Natural Gas Project. A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS was published in the Federal Register on January 28, 1997. An amendment to the NOI was published in the Federal Register on February 3, 1998, which adjusted the western boundary of the South Area to the location evaluated in this EIS. The BLM prepared a scoping information packet and provided copies of it to federal, state, and local agencies; Native American groups; and members of the general public. In addition, the BLM conducted public scoping meetings in Price, Utah; Castle Dale, Utah; and Salt Lake City, Utah on February 11, 12, and 13, 1997, respectively. The environmental issues identified are described in for the proposed are described in the Ferron EIS. A summary of the results of the scoping are maintained in the Price Field Office.

In addition, the Price Field Office issued a Notice of Intent (NOI) to revise the above land use plans in the Federal Register on November 7, 2001 initiating public scoping. This scoping included the No Action Alternative, which represents current management, as outlined in the 1983 Price River MFP and the 1991 San Rafael RMP as altered through amendment and policy since adoption of the records of decision for those plans.

Coordination Letters were sent via electronic mail to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on December 12, 2005, and February 15, 2006. E-mail supplements to the coordination letters were sent on March 16, 2006 and March 29, 2006. FWS responses were submitted on March 3, 2006 and March 17, 2006. An additional response for seven parcels is still pending.

A letter concerning leasing parcels near and contiguous to Capital Reef National Park was received from the National Park Service (NPS). The NPS has concerns about access, visual resources, cultural resources

Item 7: No for the following parcels: None

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet. An Interdisciplinary checklist is attached to this DNA.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Sue Burger	Physical Science Technician	Coal
Rebecca Doolittle	Geologist	Saleable & Locatable Minerals
Tom Gnojek	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness
Brad Higdon	Environmental Coordinator	NEPA
Karl Ivory	Range Management Specialist	T&E Plants/Weeds
Mike Leschin	Geologist/Paleontology	Paleontology
Dennis Willis	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness, ACECs, Recreation, Visual Resources
Mary Maddux	Natural Resource Specialist	Soils/ Native American Consultation
Mike Robinson	Realty Specialist	Realty
Blaine Miller	Archaeologist	Cultural Resource
Mike Tweddell	Range Management Specialist	Wild Horses & Burros
David Waller	Wildlife Biologist	T&E Wildlife

F. Mitigation Measures: The following Lease Notices and/or Lease Stipulations should be applied to the identified, subsequent parcels (these are in addition to those applied by the Utah State Office).

LEASE STIPULATIONS- WO-IM
<p>1. Lease Stipulation-Cultural Resources (WO-IM-2005-003); This Stipulation Shall be Applied to All Parcels</p> <p><i>"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." WO-IM 2005-03.</i></p>
<p>2. Lease Stipulation-Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation (WO-IM-2002-174): This stipulation shall be applied to all parcels.</p> <p><i>The lease area may now or hereafter contain plants, animals, or their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objective to avoid BLM-approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. BLM may require modifications to or disapprove proposed activity that is likely to result in jeopardy to the continued existence of a proposed or listed threatened or endangered species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of a designated or proposed critical habitat. BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligations under applicable requirements of the Endangered Species Act as amended, 16 U.S.C. §1531 et seq., including completion of any required procedure for conference or consultation.</i></p>

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

<p>LEASE STIPULATIONS (Parcels marked with * have been partially deferred. Stipulations may not be applicable to portions of parcels recommended for leasing. See Attachment 3.)</p>		
<p>UT-S-03 - Olsen Reservoir – should be applied to the following parcel:</p>		
<p>UT0506-161: add S2NE, S2 Sec. 5. (Wetland is Section 5).</p>		
<p>UT-S-04 No Surface Occupancy – should be added to the following parcels:</p>		
<p>UT0506-147: canal located in portions of section 3, 10 and 11 UT0506-148: canal located in portions of section 14. UT0506-150: canal T.17 S., R 10 E., section 7 S2NW4 and sec. 8 SWNE</p>		
<p>UT-S-13 -Antelope Habitat, Winter Range –should be added to the following parcels:</p>		
UT0506-152	UT0506-169	UT0506-176
UT0506-153	UT0506-170	UT0506-177
UT0506-154	UT0506-171	UT0506-221
UT0506-155	UT0506-172	UT0506-222
UT0506-167	UT0506-174	
UT0506-168		
<p>UT-S-14 -Flood Plains, Perennial Streams, Springs and Wetlands - should be added to the following parcels:</p>		
<p>UT0506-142: T. 12 S., R. 9 E., Sec. 4: all; (Horse Creek) Sec. 5: all, (Price River). UT0506-143: T. 12 S., R. 9 E., Sec. 8: N2, E2SE,Sec. 9: NW, NWSW. (Price River). UT0506-149: NE4 of section 26 and the W2 of section 25. UT0506-157: located in the section 8, S2SW (Price River). UT0506-162: S2, Sec. 18. UT0506-163: E2, Sec. 19 and NWNW, Sec. 22. UT0506-166: NWNW, SWNE Sec. 33 and NENW Sec. 34. UT0506-178: T. 14 S., R. 12 E., Sec. 20: E2NW4, SESW; Sec. 21: SW (Dugout Creek) UT0506-196: in portions of W2SW Sec. 26, (Cow Canyon). UT0506-198: in portions of NESE Sec. 13, (Right Fork Whitmore Canyon). UT0506-199: in portions of NE Sec. 15 and E2SW, (springs). UT0506-201: in the E2SE, SWSE of Sec. 11, NWSW of Sec. 12 and NWNE Sec. 14 (Icelander Creek). UT0506-202: located in SESW Sec. 3, S2SW of Sec. 5 and SW, Sec. 6 (Grassy Trail Creek). UT0506-203: in the S2SE Sec. 17 and SE Sec. 18. UT0506-204: and W2NE, E2W2 Sec. 8 (Icelander Creek). UT0506-204-A : Price River UT0506-205: T. 16 S., R. 13 E., Sec. 29: E2 (Grassy Trail Creek). UT0506-250: Sec. 5: SWSW (Lost Spring Wash). UT0506-251: Sec. 6: NW4, SE4 (Lost Spring Wash). UT0506-253: Sec. 10 W2W2, N2 (Lost Spring Wash).</p>		
<p>UT-S-103 – VISUAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (VRM) CLASS III-Should be added to the following parcels:</p>		
UT-0506-262-A*	UT-0506-269-D*	
UT-0506-262-B*	UT0506-269-F*	
UT-0506-262-C*	UT0506-269-H*	
UT-0506-269-A*	UT0506-269-G*	
UT-0506-269-B*		
UT-0506-269-C*		

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT-S-109- Crucial Raptor Nesting Habitat- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-126	UT0506-204	
UT0506-134	UT0506-204-A	
UT0506-136	UT0506-241	
UT0506-179	UT0506-242	
UT0506-183	UT0506-243	
UT0506-196		
UT-S-114- Elk and Deer Winter Range -Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-142	UT0506-239*	
UT0506-143	UT0506-240*	
UT0506-156	UT0506-241	
UT0506-178	UT0506- 242	
UT0506-179	UT0506-260*	
UT0506-201	UT0506-262	
UT0506-231		
UT-S-120- Unconditional No Surface Occupancy-Should be applied to the following parcels:		
UT0506-262-B*: lot 6, SESW, portions of lot 7; portions of lot 1, NENW, N2W, N2NE, SENENE Sec. 7 (San Rafael River)		
UT0506-262-C*: portions of S2SE, Sec. 10 (San Rafael River)		
UT0506-269-H* : in portions of Sec. 27 and 34 (Three Canyon)		
UT0506-269-I*: in portions of E2SE, Sec. 33, (Three Canyon)		
UT-S-122 -Water Fowl, Olsen Reservoir - Should be added to the following parcel:		
UT0506-161		
UT-S-124 -Greater Sage Grouse nesting habitat- Should be applied to the following parcels:		
UT0506-142	UT0506-231	UT0506-239*
UT0506-143	UT0506-232	UT0506-240*
UT0506-196	UT0506-233	UT0506-259
UT0506-197	UT0506-234	UT0506-260*
UT0506-198	UT0506-235	UT0506-262
UT0506-199	UT0506-237*	
UT-S-125-Raptor Nesting Surveys- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-126	UT0506-196	
UT0506-179	UT0506-136	
UT0506-134	UT0506-204-A	
TAR SANDS - Lease stipulations from the Utah Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Regional EIS (Parcels marked with * have been partially deferred.)		
Sunnyside Municipal water supply reserve stipulation		
UT0206-239*		
UT0206-240*		
Sage grouse timing limitation stipulation		
UT0206-260 *		
UT0206-262		
No surface occupancy on slopes in excess of 50%; total surface disturbance of 25% per lease; hydrologic testing and evaluation stipulation; elk and deer summer range timing limitation.		
UT0206-197	UT0206-199	
UT0206-198		

Attachment 1-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

No surface occupancy on slopes in excess of 50%; total surface disturbance of 25% per lease; hydrologic testing and evaluation stipulation; and deer winter range timing limitation stipulations.		
UT0206-227	UT0206-237*	
UT0206-228	UT0206-239*	
UT0206-232	UT0206-240*	
UT0206-233	UT0206-260*	
No surface occupancy in floodplain and riparian area of Stone Cabin Creek		
UT0206-231		
UT0206-232		
No surface occupancy in floodplain and riparian area of Dry Creek		
UT0206-235		
UT0206-261		
No surface occupancy in floodplain and riparian area of Cottonwood Creek		
UT0206-260*		
LEASE NOTICES (Parcels marked with * have been partially deferred.)		
NEW LEASE NOTICE - A Lease Notice concerning the prohibition of using lands in Capital Reef National Park should be added to parcels		
UT0506-120	UT0506-126	UT0506-132
UT0506-121	UT0506-127	UT0506-133
UT0506-122	UT0506-128	UT0506-134
UT0506-123	UT0506-129	UT0506-135
UT0506-124	UT0506-130	UT0506-136
UT0506-125	UT0506-131	UT0506-137
UT-LN-07- Raptor Crucial Cliff Nesting Complexes- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-126	UT0506-182	UT0506-243
UT0506-134	UT0506-183	UT0506-244
UT0506-136	UT0506-204	UT0506-253
UT0506-178	UT0506-241	
UT0506-179	UT0506-242	
UT-LN-08- Raptor Habitat, Northern Goshawk- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-239*		
UT0506-240*		
UT-LN-12- Crucial Elk Habitat - Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-142	UT0506-231	UT0506-241
UT0506-143	UT0506-239*	UT0506-242
UT0506-194*	UT0506-240*	UT0506-260*
UT-LN-13- Lease Notice - Burrowing Owl - Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-262-C*		
UT0506-253-G		
UT-LN-29- Special Plant Species (Cryptantha creutzfeldtii) - Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-144		
UT0506-156		
UT0506-177		

Attachment I-DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT-LN-30- Palcontological Resources- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-120	UT0506-133	UT0506-176
UT0506-121	UT0506-134	UT0506-185*
UT0506-122	UT0506-135	UT0506-186
UT0506-123	UT0506-136	UT0506-187 *
UT0506-124	UT0506-137	UT0506-188
UT0506-125	UT0506-151	UT0506-189*
UT0506-126	UT0506-152	UT0506-190*
UT0506-127	UT0506-153	UT0506-191*
UT0506-128	UT0506-155	UT0506-204-A
UT0506-129	UT0506-164*	UT0506-206
UT0506-130	UT0506-166	UT0506-211*
UT0506-131	UT0506-168	UT0506-210*
UT0506-132	UT0506-172	
UT-LN-33- Raptor Surveys, Northern Goshawk, Ferruginous Hawk, crucial Nesting complexes- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-178	UT0506-204	UT0506-242
UT0506-179	UT0506-239	UT0506-243
UT0506-182	UT0506-240	UT0506-244
UT0506-183	UT0506-241	UT0506-253
UT0506-196		
UT-LN-35- Palcontological Resources- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-120	UT0506-133	UT0506-172
UT0506-121	UT0506-134	UT0506-176
UT0506-122	UT0506-135	UT0506-185*
UT0506-123	UT0506-136	UT0506-186
UT0506-124	UT0506-137	UT0506-187*
UT0506-125	UT0506-151	UT0506-188
UT0506-126	UT0506-152	UT0506-189*
UT0506-127	UT0506-153	UT0506-190*
UT0506-128	UT0506-155	UT0506-191*
UT0506-129	UT0506-164*	UT0506-206
UT0506-130	UT0506-166	UT0506-211*
UT0506-131	UT0506-168	UT0506-210*
UT0506-132	UT0506-170	
UT-LN-39 - Lease Notice - Antelope Fawning- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-179	UT0506-185*	
UT0506-181	UT0506-186	
UT0506-182	UT0506-188	
UT0506-183	UT0506-205	
UT0506-184	UT0506-207	
UT-LN-41- Lease Notice- Noxious Weeds - Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-142	UT0506-201	UT0506-209*
UT0506-143	UT0506-202	UT0506-210*
UT0506-161	UT0506-203	UT0506-211*
UT0506-194*	UT0506-204	UT0506-212*
UT0506-196	UT0506-204-A	UT0506-213*
UT0506-198	UT0506-205	UT0506-214*
UT0506-199	UT0506-208*	

Attachment 1:DNA-PFO
3/31/2006 Final

UT-LN-47-Cultural Resources San Rafael Desert - Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-120	UT0506-135	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-121	UT0506-136	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-122	UT0506-137	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-123	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-124	UT0506-221	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-125	UT0506-222	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-126	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-127	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-129	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-130	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-131	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-133	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-134	UT0506-220-G	
UT-LN-51-Greater Sage Grouse Habitat-Wintering Ground		
UT0506-269*		
UN-LN-52-Utah Sensitive Species, Bluehead Sucker, Flannelmouth Sucker, Roundtail Chub Colorado River Cutthroat Trout, Migratory Birds- Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-157	UT0506-208*	UT0506-215*
UT0506-158	UT0506-209*	UT0506-245*
UT0506-164*	UT0506-210*	
UT0506-187*	UT0506-211*	
UT0506-189*	UT0506-213*	
UT0506-190*	UT0506-214*	
UT-LN- 53- White-tailed Prairie Dog -Should be added to the following parcels:		
UT0506-144	UT0506-204	UT0506-244
UT0506-147	UT0506-213*	UT0506-245
UT0506-151	UT0506-216	UT0506-246
UT0506-202	UT0506-217	
UT-LN- 56-Price Field Office- Should be added to the following parcels:		
All parcels offered in the May 2006 sale		
Threatened and Endangered Species Lease Notices		
T&E-01 - Bald Eagle should be applied to the following parcels		
UT0506-149		
UT0506-269-A*		
UT0506-269-B*		
UT0506-269-E		
T&E-02- Black Footed Ferret		
UT0506-144	UT0506-204	UT0506-244
UT0506-147	UT0506-213*	UT0506-245*
UT0506-151	UT0506-216	UT0506-246*
UT0506-202	UT0506-217	UT0506-253

Attachment 1-DNA-PRO
3/31/2006 Final

T&E-03 - Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage		
UT0506-157 UT0506-158 UT0506-164* UT0506-187* UT0506-189* UT0506-190* UT0506-208*	UT0506-209* UT0506-210* UT0506-211* UT0506-213* UT0506-214* UT0506-215* UT0506-245*	UT0506-262-A* UT0506-262-B* UT0506-262-C* UT0506-269-A* UT0506-269-B* UT0506-269-C* UT0506-269-D*
T&E-05- Listed Plants- <i>Sclerocactus wrightiae</i>, <i>Townsendia aprica</i>, <i>Pedlocactus despainii</i>. Should be applied to the following parcels:		
UT0506-120 UT0506-121 UT0506-122 UT0506-123 UT0506-124 UT0506-125 UT0506-126	UT0506-127 UT0506-128 UT0506-129 UT0506-130 UT0506-131 UT0506-132 UT0506-133	UT0506-134 UT0506-135 UT0506-136 UT0506-137 UT0506-216
T&E-06 Mexican Spotted Owl (with designated critical habitat information) - Should be applied to parcels:		
None - All parcels deferred.		
T&E-06 Mexican Spotted Owl (without designated critical habitat information) - Should be applied to parcels:		
UT0506-194* UT0506-196 UT0506-197 UT0506-198 UT0506-231	UT0506-232 UT0506-233 UT0506-234 UT0506-235 UT0506-236	UT0506-239* UT0506-240* UT0506-269-F* UT0506-269-H*

Attachment 1
 May 2006 Lease Sale DNA
 Price Field Office

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):

UT0506-120	UT0506-163	UT0506-205	UT0506-241
UT0506-121	UT0506-164*	UT0506-206	UT0506-242
UT0506-122	UT0506-165	UT0506-207	UT0506-243
UT0506-123	UT0506-166	UT0506-208*	UT0506-244
UT0506-124	UT0506-167	UT0506-209*	UT0506-245*
UT0506-125	UT0506-168	UT0506-210*	UT0506-246*
UT0506-126	UT0506-169	UT0506-211*	UT0506-248
UT0506-127	UT0506-170	UT0506-212*	UT0506-249
UT0506-128	UT0506-171	UT0506-213*	UT0506-250
UT0506-130	UT0506-172	UT0506-214*	UT0506-251
UT0506-131	UT0506-174	UT0506-215*	UT0506-252
UT0506-132	UT0506-176	UT0506-216	UT0506-253
UT0506-133	UT0506-177	UT0506-217	UT0506-253-A
UT0506-134	UT0506-178	UT0506-218	UT0506-253-B
UT0506-135	UT0506-179	UT0506-219	UT0506-253-C
UT0506-136	UT0506-181	UT0506-220	UT0506-253-D
UT0506-137	UT0506-182	UT0506-220-A	UT0506-253-E
UT0506-142	UT0506-183	UT0506-220-B	UT0506-253-F
UT0506-143	UT0506-184	UT0506-220-C	UT0506-253-G
UT0506-144	UT0506-185*	UT0506-220-D	UT0506-253-H
UT0506-145*	UT0506-186	UT0506-220-E	UT0506-253-I
UT0506-146	UT0506-187*	UT0506-220-F	UT0506-253-J
UT0506-148	UT0506-188	UT0506-220-G	UT0506-253-K
UT0506-149	UT0506-189*	UT0506-221	UT0506-253-L
UT0506-150	UT0506-190*	UT0506-222	UT0506-259
UT0506-151	UT0506-191	UT0506-227*	UT0506-261
UT0506-152	UT0506-194*	UT0506-228*	UT0506-262
UT0506-153	UT0506-196	UT0506-231	UT0506-262-A*
UT0506-154	UT0506-197	UT0506-232	UT0506-262-B*
UT0506-155	UT0506-198	UT0506-233	UT0506-262-C*
UT0506-156	UT0506-199	UT0506-234	UT0506-269-C*
UT0506-157	UT0506-201	UT0506-235	UT0506-269-D*
UT0506-158	UT0506-202	UT0506-236	UT0506-269-F*
UT0506-159	UT0506-203	UT0506-237*	UT0506-269-G*
UT0506-160*	UT0506-203A	UT0506-238	UT0506-269-H*
UT0506-161	UT0506-204	UT0506-239	UT0506-269-I*
UT0506-162	UT0506-204A	UT0506-240	UT0506-308

Attachment 1
May 2006 Lease Sale DNA
Price Field Office

Based on new information regarding relevant and important resources, and wild and scenic river eligibility, 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):

UT0506-138	UT0506-208*	UT0506-247	UT0506-268-B
UT0506-139	UT0506-209*	UT0506-255	UT0506-268-C
UT0506-140	UT0506-210*	UT0506-256	UT0506-269
UT0506-147	UT0506-211*	UT0506-257	UT0506-269-A
UT0506-164*	UT0506-212*	UT0506-258	UT0506-269-B
UT0506-173	UT0506-213*	UT0506-260	UT0506-269-C*
UT0506-175	UT0506-214*	UT0506-262-A*	UT0506-269-D*
UT0506-185*	UT0506-215*	UT0506-262-B*	UT0506-269-E
UT0506-187*	UT0506-227*	UT0506-262-C*	UT0506-269-F*
UT0506-189*	UT0506-228*	UT0506-264	UT0506-269-G*
UT0506-190*	UT0506-229	UT0506-265	UT0506-269-H*
UT0506-191*	UT0506-230	UT0506-266	UT0506-269-I*
UT0506-193	UT0506-237*	UT0506-267	UT0506-271
UT0506-194*	UT0506-245*	UT0506-268	UT0506-271-A
UT0506-195	UT0506-246*	UT0506-268-A	



Signature of the Responsible Official

3.31.06

Date

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST

Project Title: *May 2006 Lease Sale*

NEPA Log Number:

File/Serial Number: *3120*

Project Leader: *Rebecca Doolittle*

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.

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
CRITICAL ELEMENTS				
<i>NI</i>	Air Quality	<i>Highly affected</i>	<i>Theresa Baker</i>	<i>3/13/06</i>
<i>NI</i>	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		<i>Theresa Baker</i>	<i>3/13/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Cultural Resources	<i>Blaine Martin</i>	<i>Blaine Martin</i>	<i>3/17/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Environmental Justice		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>3/15/06</i>
<i>NI</i>	Farmlands (Prime or Unique)		<i>Bryan Decker</i>	<i>3/20/2006</i>
<i>NC</i>	Floodplains	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>3/16/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Invasive, Non-native Species		<i>Karl Wong</i>	<i>3/17/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Native American Religious Concerns	<i>No concerns identified</i>	<i>Blaine Martin</i>	<i>3/17/06</i>
<i>NI/NC</i>	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species	<i>TES species present within lease sale. Not affected to degree of analysis.</i>	<i>Karl Wong</i>	<i>3/17/06</i>
<i>NI/NC</i>	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		<i>David K. Miller</i>	<i>2006-10-13</i>
<i>NC</i>	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>3/16/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Water Quality (drinking/ground)		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>3/16/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		<i>Karl Wong</i>	<i>3/17/06</i>
<i>NC</i>	Wild and Scenic Rivers		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>3/15/06</i>

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM ANALYSIS RECORD CHECKLIST RATIONALE

Air Quality - The potential impacts of oil and gas development on air quality were adequately analyzed in the NEPA documents cited in Item C of the DNA. There would be no significant changes in circumstances or conditions that warrant further analysis relative to leasing.

Areas of Critical Environmental Concern - Recommended parcels are located in the following potential ACECs: Temple-Cottonwood-Dugout, Gordon Creek, Grassy Trail, and Mussentuchitt Badlands. The application of stipulations, standard lease terms and conditions, and lease notices would afford protection to relevant and important values. Refer to Section D.3 of the DNA for further discussion.

Cultural Resources - All parcels within this lease sale were reviewed for the presence of cultural resources. Previous cultural resource surveys and recorded cultural properties were identified from the records search. The existing inventories and others surrounding these parcels are sufficient to determine that historic properties are likely to be present on each proposed lease parcel. Site specific analysis would be conducted at the Application for Permit to Drill stage where the presence of cultural resources would be confirmed and measures to protect these resources would be defined in the Conditions of Approval. It is submitted that this oil and gas lease undertaking falls under the purview of the Protocol negotiated between BLM and the Utah State Historic Preservation Office. Further, the view taken here is that the undertaking does not exceed any of the review thresholds listed in Part VII (A) of the Protocol, and that it may be viewed as a No Historic Properties Affected; eligible sites present, but not affected as defined by 36CFR800.4 [VII (A) C (4)]. The determination was based on a conclusion that at least one well could be located on each parcel without adversely affecting cultural properties. Separate consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office was completed for parcel 271A since this parcel is not included within the Protocol Agreement. On March 22, 2006, a response letter was received from SHPO concurring with the finding of "no adverse effect" (Attachment 4). Refer to Section D.3 and Attachment 4 of the DNA for further discussion.

Environmental Justice - Impacts to local communities are addressed in a portion of the existing NEPA record. Leasing would not adversely or disproportionately affect minority, low income or disadvantaged groups.

Farmlands (Prime or Unique) - None of the parcels contain lands that meet the criteria for prime, state important or unique farmlands.

Floodplains - In conformance with the planning documents cited in the DNA, parcels or portions of parcels having floodplains and riparian/aquatic areas would be leased with NSO stipulations to protect those areas. Additionally, application of standard lease terms and the "200 meter" rule of 43 CFR 3101.1-2 prior to any surface disturbing activities would afford additional protection.

Invasive, Non-native Species - Invasive, non-native weed species are addressed in some of the NEPA documents referenced in the DNA. The BLM coordinates with County and local governments to conduct an active program for control of invasive species. Standard operating procedures (SOPs) and best management practices (BMPs) such as washing of vehicles and annual monitoring and spraying along with site specific mitigation are applied as approval

conditions for authorizations of surface disturbing activities to prevent the spread or introduction of invasive, non-native species.

Native American Religious Concerns - Letters containing information and notification of this lease sale were sent to the following Tribes on January 27, 2006: Southern Ute, Navajo, Shoshone-Wyoming, Hopi, Goshute, Zuni, Uintah and Ouray Ute, Ute Mountain Ute, Northwestern Band of the Shoshone, Shoshone-Bannock, and Paiute. The letters detailed the leasing proposal and requested tribal comments and concerns about the sale. Only one response was received, however, no concerns pertaining to leasing of the preliminary parcels was included nor were other leasing concerns received. BLM concludes that there are no potential impacts on traditional cultural properties. 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. Refer to Section D.3 and Attachment 4 of the DNA for further discussion.

Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species - Based on existing inventories, the only T&E and candidate species known to occur within, or in proximity of the parcels offered for sale are *Pediocactus despainii*, *Sclerocactus wrightiae*, *Sclerocactus glaucus* and *Townsendia aprica*. The Price FO has determined that these species are not likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action. The USFWS has concurred with this determination. Refer to Section D.3 and Attachment 4 of the DNA for further discussion.

Threatened, Endangered or Sensitive Animal Species - The Price FO has determined that T&E and candidate species including the bald eagle, Mexican spotted owl, black-footed ferret, bonytail chub, Colorado pikeminnow, humpback chub and razorback sucker are not likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action. The USFWS has concurred with this determination. The following sensitive animal species/habitat may occur within, or in proximity of parcels offered for sale: northern goshawk, ferruginous hawk, white-tailed prairie dog, greater sage grouse wintering grounds, burrowing owl, bluehead sucker, flannelmouth sucker, roundtail chub, and Colorado River cutthroat trout. Application of lease stipulations, notices and approval conditions would afford protection for these species. Additionally, a stipulation for protection of special status species is added to all parcels. Refer to Section D.3 and Attachment 4 of the DNA for further discussion.

Wastes (hazardous or solid) - Drilling fluids, produced waters, and other wastes associated with the exploration, development or production of crude or natural gas are excluded as a hazardous waste under 40 CFR 261.4(b)(4). As recognized in previous analyses, site specific mitigation applied as conditions of approval (COA) at the APD stage would be sufficient to ensure proper containment, transport and disposal of solid or toxic waste if any are required or generated.

Water Quality (drinking/ground) - As recognized in previous NEPA documents, standard SOPs, BMPs and site specific mitigation applied as COAs at the APD stage would be sufficient to isolate and protect all usable water zones. The SOPs include the requirements for disposal of produced water contained in Onshore Oil and Gas Order (OOGO) No. 7 and the requirements for drilling operations contained in OOGO No. 2.

Wetlands/Riparian Zones - In conformance with applicable planning documents, parcels or portions of parcels having wetlands and riparian/aquatic areas would be leased with NSO and/or CSU stipulations to protect those areas. Additionally, application of standard lease terms and the "200 meter" rule of 43 CFR 3101.1-2 prior to any surface disturbing activities would afford additional protection.

Wild and Scenic Rivers - Recommended parcels encompass or are adjacent to sections of the following suitable wild and scenic river segments: Nine Mile Creek and Green River, Range Creek, Price River and San Rafael River. Lands offered for lease are set back at least one quarter mile from these river segments. The application of stipulations, standard lease terms and conditions, lease notices, BMPs and the "200 meter rule" of 43 CFR 3101.1-2 would afford additional protection.

Wilderness - There are no BLM Wilderness Study Areas or designated wilderness areas in the parcels recommended for leasing.

OTHER RESOURCES/CONCERNS - RATIONALE

Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines - Water quality, vegetation, Threatened & Endangered Species habitat and other components of ecological conditions that are considered in Rangeland Health Standards and Guides have been analyzed in the previous NEPA documents pertaining to the nominated parcels. Given the application of stipulations, notices, best management practices (BMPs) standard operating procedures (SOPs), and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as conditions of approval (COA), it is concluded that Rangeland Health Standards would be met.

Livestock Grazing - Given the application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs, it is concluded that existing analysis is adequate and that livestock grazing operation would not be affected. Pits at drill sites and production facilities would be fenced. Any facilities such as fences and cattleguards that would be affected would be replaced or restored and disturbed areas would be reclaimed.

Woodland/Forestry - Given the application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs, it is concluded that woodland or forest resources would not be affected in a way not already analyzed in existing NEPA documents.

Vegetation - Given the application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs, including reclamation, it is concluded that existing NEPA documents adequately analyze potential impacts on vegetation.

Wildlife - Recommended parcels or portions of parcels within crucial wildlife habitat would be leased with special stipulations that prevent drilling operations during the crucial period. The application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs including reclamation to re-establish habitat, would mitigate impacts to wildlife. The current sensitive species list was not addressed in the existing NEPA documents. However, a special status species stipulation would be added to all of the recommended parcels to mitigate impacts to sensitive species.

Soils - Given the application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs, it is concluded that existing analysis is adequate and potential impacts on soils have been adequately addressed.

Recreation – Offering the parcels would not exceed the activity levels analyzed in the referenced NEPA documents. The application of stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs, and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage as COAs, would reduce impacts to current recreation uses.

Visual Resources - For surface lands managed by the BLM, the lands are managed as Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class II, III and IV. Management objectives for VRM Class II lands are to retain the existing landscape character where changes in landscape may be seen, but must not attract attention. Management objectives for VRM Class III lands are to partially retain the existing landscape character. Management objectives for Class IV are to provide for activities which require major modification of the existing landscape. Given the level of development analyzed and documented in the NEPA documents referenced in this DNA, and application lease stipulations and notices and BMPs, SOPs and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage, including the ability to move operation up to 200 meters, VRM impacts would meet current VRM Class II, III and IV requirements for the parcels recommended for leasing.

Geology/Mineral Resources/Energy Production - For the parcels recommended for leasing, the existing NEPA documents adequately addresses the impacts of oil and gas leasing, as they address oil and gas operations and the impacts that could result from exploration through development. No other recorded or authorized mineral-related uses are present on the parcels recommended for leasing, and any conflicts between oil and gas operations and other mineral operations could be resolved at the time of any application related to oil and gas exploration and development.

Paleontology - Impacts to paleontological resources are not anticipated. Surveys would be completed, as needed, prior to surface disturbing activities. The use of BMPs, SOPs and COAs would assure that paleontological resources are protected. These measures would include monitoring during initial construction when necessary.

Lands/Access - Any proposed project would be subject to prior existing rights-of-way (ROW) and any operations would be coordinated with ROW holders and adjacent non-federal landowners. Off-lease ancillary facilities that cross public land, if any, may require a separate authorization. Existing rights-of-way in proposed operation areas would not be affected because application of standard operating procedures (SOPs), and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage, including the ability to move operation up to 200 meters, would ensure that communication sites, water projects, and power lines etc. would be avoided, restored or replaced. Potential issues include but are not limited to surface disturbance within and outside described project area and generated trash/debris/waste. Portions of parcels UT-0506-239 and UT-0506-240 fall within the Sunnyside Watershed Withdrawal which is not open to leasing. These lands will not be offered for lease.

Fuels/Fire Management - Fire and fuels management was not specifically addressed in existing NEPA documents. However, application of standard operating procedures (SOPs), and site specific mitigation and safety measures applied at the APD stage would minimize the risk of inadvertent ignition. Therefore, impacts to fire or fuels management are not expected.

Socio-economics - Socio-economic conditions are adequately addressed in the existing NEPA record. Given the level of development analyzed and documented in the NEPA documents referenced in this DNA, no further socio-economic analysis is required for the parcels recommended for leasing.

Wild Horses and Burros – Parcels fall within the Range Creek, Robbers Roost and Muddy Creek Herd Management Areas. Application of lease stipulations, notices, BMPs, SOPs and site specific mitigation applied at the APD stage would protect wild horses.

Wilderness Characteristics - Some parcels are identified as having wilderness characteristics, however, BLM has adequately considered the characteristics that make up wilderness characteristics in the existing NEPA documents. There is no Bureau policy to protect wilderness characteristics outside of WSAs or designated wilderness, except as directed in an existing land use plan. None of the parcels offered are located in WSAs or designated wilderness areas.