



United States Department of the Interior
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Utah State Office
P.O. Box 45155
Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0155
<http://www.blm.gov/ut/st/en.html>



IN REPLY REFER TO:
3100 / (UT-922)

CERTIFIED MAIL – 7008 1140 0002 1094 1990
Return Receipt Requested

SEP 30 2009

DECISION

Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership : Protest to the Inclusion of
Attn: Joel A. Webster : Parcels in the June 23, 2009
2321 Gerald Ave. : Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale
Missoula, Montana 59801 :

Protest Denied

On April 13, 2009, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) provided notice (Notice of Competitive Lease Sale) that 67 parcels of land would be offered in a competitive oil and gas lease sale scheduled for June 23, 2009. The notice also indicated that the protest period for the lease sale would end on May 13, 2009. In a letter received at the BLM on June 8, 2009, the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP) protested the inclusion of 31 parcels in the sale. The protested parcels are on public lands administered by BLM's Fillmore, Price, Monticello and Vernal Field Offices, as follows:

Fillmore Field Office

UTU87304 (UT1108-007)	UTU87307 (UT1108-011)
UTU87305 (UT1108-009)	UTU87308 (UT1108-017)
UTU87306 (UT1108-010)	UTU87309 (UT1108-026)

Price Field Office

UTU87315 (UT0509-027)	UTU87330 (UT0509-042)
UTU87316 (UT0509-028)	UTU87331 (UT0509-043)
UTU87318 (UT0509-030)	UTU87332 (UT0509-044)
UTU87329 (UT0509-041)	UTU87338 (UT0509-050)

Monticello Field Office

UTU87345 (UT0509-063)
UTU87346 (UT0509-064)
UTU87347 (UT0509-065)
UTU87348 (UT0509-066)
UTU87349 (UT0509-067)
UTU87350 (UT0509-068)
UTU87351 (UT0509-069)

UTU87352 (UT0509-070)
UTU87353 (UT0509-071)
UTU87354 (UT0509-072)
UTU87355 (UT0509-073)
UTU87360 (UT0509-079)
UTU87361 (UT0509-080)
UTU87367 (UT0509-086)

Vernal Field Office

UTU87341 (UT0509-054)
UTU87343 (UT0509-058)

UTU87344 (UT0509-060)

By errata notice dated June 16, 2009, the BLM deferred offering the following 14 parcels covered by the TRCP protest: UTU87345, UTU87346, UTU87347, UTU87348, UTU87349, UTU87350, UTU87351, UTU87352, UTU87353, UTU87354, UTU87355, UTU87360, UTU87361 and UTU87367. Consequently, the protest as to these parcels is denied as moot.

This decision addresses the TRCP protest as it pertains to the remaining 17 protested parcels.

As a preliminary matter, many of the protest points express TRCP's concern about the potential effects to wildlife, including big game and sage grouse, from oil and gas development on public lands. These protest points also discuss TRCP's stated organizational goal of working to ensure that oil and gas development in the western states is balanced with the needs of fish and wildlife resources and with the recreational needs of TRCP's members. However, most of the TRCP protest points set forth only very general statements or conclusions. For the BLM to have a reasonable basis to consider protests that TRCP may submit in the future, TRCP should be as specific as possible in its protest and should identify for each parcel it protests, the specific ground for protest and explain how it applies to the parcel. Any allegations of error based on fact must be supported by competent evidence, and a protest should not merely state general concerns or conclusions, or simply incorporate by reference arguments or factual information. Further, TRCP must consider whether any lease stipulations or notices that apply to a particular parcel may be relevant to its allegations, and explain how such stipulations or notices do not obviate the allegations. Failure to comply with any of the foregoing may result in the summary dismissal of the protest.¹

TRCP Protest Contentions and the BLM Responses

TRCP contention: The BLM has not considered the importance of habitats and is not protecting the habitats of species as outlined in comprehensive habitat management planning for mule deer, elk, greater sage-grouse and Gunnison sage-grouse. The BLM is also negligent in managing habitats to meet Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) objectives for populations. Leasing and subsequent surface development and road construction will render

¹ It is well established that the BLM properly dismisses a protest where the protestant makes only conclusory or vague allegations or the protestant's allegations are unsupported by facts in the record or competent evidence. See, e.g., Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, 122 IBLA 17, 20-21 (1992); John W. Childress, 76 IBLA 42, 43 (1983); Patricia C. Alker, 70 IBLA 211, 212 (1983); Geosearch, Inc., 48 IBLA 76 (1980).

these lands unsuitable for management of mule deer and elk crucial winter range and migration routes, along with overall habitat for greater sage-grouse and Gunnison sage-grouse.

BLM response: The BLM coordinated extensively with and requested comments from DWR on the June 2009 Oil and Gas Lease Sale Parcel List on a parcel-specific basis. The DWR provided comments on a parcel-specific basis and each of its recommendations were incorporated into the final parcel list. The review by the DWR field specialists considered the effects of oil and gas leasing activity on elk, mule deer, and big game in general (winter range and fawning or calving), greater sage-grouse, and Gunnison sage-grouse, along with other species. The DWR also participated in the development of the relevant stipulations and notices in the Resource Management Plans and other decisions related to oil and gas leasing, and is aware of what each are for the field offices. The DWR also considers migration corridors and comments on any important migration pathways if and when affected by parcels being offered in a lease sale. Therefore, development of the 17 remaining protested parcels, with the attached stipulations, should not have a significant impact on elk, mule deer, greater sage-grouse and Gunnison sage-grouse.

TRCP contention: The BLM is not following the recommendations of the Western Governors' Association Policy Resolution 07-01, which recommends protection of wildlife migration corridors and state wildlife agency designated crucial habitats.

BLM response: TRCP's contention is incorrect, as the BLM is following and will continue to follow the recommendations of Policy Resolution 07-01. The BLM has engaged the DWR throughout the pre-leasing process and the BLM continues to inform the DWR on its activities and solicit its input on wildlife matters. In the pre-leasing review process conducted for the June 2009 sale, the BLM consulted with the DWR regarding the potential for impacts to big game. No migration corridors issues were identified on any of the subject parcels by either the BLM or DWR. The BLM will continue to cooperatively manage habitats and take every opportunity to communicate with the DWR and consider any concerns raised by it in the BLM's management of public lands and wildlife habitats.

TRCP contention: BLM violated the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in its preparation of an environmental assessment (EA) instead of an environmental impact statement (EIS) for Fillmore Field Office (FFO) managed lands included in the June 2009 lease sale because of the significant impact of oil and gas leasing on mule deer and elk. An EIS is warranted because the reasonable foreseeable development (RFD) scenario is arbitrary and it contains no analysis on potential impacts to hunting.

BLM response: The BLM's preparation of an EA concerning the FFO lands fully complies with NEPA. The BLM coordinated with the DWR throughout the EA process, including the finalization of the EA. Drafts of the EA were sent directly to the DWR before releasing it to the public to receive comments and modified accordingly. The DWR has also coordinated with the BLM on parcel-specific issues for the FFO parcels that TRCP is protesting and the DWR is satisfied with the notices and protections afforded to big game.

The RFD was carried forward from two prior EAs that analyzed oil and gas leasing within the FFO (Warm Springs Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Leasing Implementation EA [BLM 1988b] and the House Range Resource Area RMP Oil and Gas Leasing Implementation EA [BLM 1988a]). The prior RFDs were reviewed by a BLM petroleum geologist and validated during the recently-completed EA process. The FFO EA is based on an assumption of an average of one well per year, consistent with the RFD. The FFO is within an area of low potential for oil and

gas, and the RFD has not been exceeded over the last 20 years. Therefore, the RFD remains valid. Leasing the FFO parcels is not inconsistent with the RFD.

TRCP's contention that the June 23, 2009 sale "will likely have a significant impact on hunting opportunities" in FFO lacks merit. TRCP submitted no data to support its contention. Further, because of the low potential for exploration reflected in the RFD, there will likely be little to no impact to hunting, which is addressed within the recreation portion of the EA. Finally, the DWR, which is in charge of this aspect of wildlife management, did not express any concern during the EA process, or when reviewing the preliminary list of parcels, regarding potential impacts to hunting.

TRCP contention: The most recently updated information on designated big game crucial winter ranges and migration routes, and sage-grouse strutting and nesting areas developed by the DWR has provided the BLM with significant new information concerning these and other special surface values of these areas that needs to be studied in supplemental NEPA analysis.

BLM response: The BLM carefully considered current DWR information in determining what parcels to include in the June 2009 lease sale. In that process, the BLM determined that although the information is relatively new, it is not the type of "significant new information" that requires the BLM to complete supplemental NEPA analysis prior to sale and lease of the subject parcels. As set forth in the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA, the duty to supplement arises when there is new information showing that the proposed action will affect the quality of the environment in a significant manner or to a significant extent not already considered. See 43 C.F.R. § 1502.9; Marsh v. Or. Natural Res. Council, 490 U.S. 360, 374 (1989). The DWR information does not fall within those parameters, and nothing in the general allegations in the TRCP protest establishes otherwise. Moreover, the BLM also contacted the DWR in February, March and April 2009 to ensure that it did not have additional information that might give rise to the duty to supplement, and the DWR did not have any such information.

Throughout the section of the protest referencing sage-grouse, TRCP attempts to use various studies and claimed "new information" to its benefit, including Wyoming research on full-field development (which is obviously a very different stage of development than leasing). TRCP also cites as an example of inadequate sage-grouse protection the FFO sage-grouse notices described in the FFO EA. However, because the Decision Record states that there will not be any leasing in sage-grouse habitat until a Land Use Planning effort can be undertaken, TRCP's contention is moot.

TRCP contention: The BLM violated NEPA by failing to consider no surface occupancy (NSO) and no-leasing alternatives.

BLM response: The generality of TRCP's contention underscores both the lack of value in generalized protest points that are mere conclusions lacking any underlying analysis, and the well-established precedent that the BLM properly dismisses a protest where the protestant makes only conclusory or vague allegations or the protestant's allegations are unsupported by facts in the record or competent evidence. TRCP's present contention regarding the alternatives it believes the BLM should have considered clearly falls within these principles. For the BLM to consider and respond to the contention, the TRCP protest should have set forth which of the four field office NEPA analyses (or all four field offices' analyses if applicable) it is referring to and explain why TRCP believes the underlying analysis or analyses is not adequate. In that sense, TRCP had the burden of providing objective evidence and explaining why the alternatives it believes should have been studied (NSO and no-leasing) would have

accomplished the purpose of the proposed action, be technically and economically feasible, and have a lesser impact than the leasing categories the BLM studied. Since TRCP was unwilling to shoulder that burden, the BLM has no duty to respond to TRCP's general contention. The BLM also notes that the TRCP contention is not factually accurate. For example, the Fillmore Field Office's Oil and Gas EA (UT-010-2008-050) analyzed the no-leasing alternative in detail but did not choose that as the preferred alternative.

TRCP contention: The BLM violated the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) by failing to prevent undue or unnecessary degradation of mule deer crucial ranges, elk winter ranges, mule deer and elk migration routes, and active sage-grouse leks and associated habitat.

BLM response: TRCP correctly recognizes that FLPMA requires the BLM to prevent unnecessary or undue degradation in its management of the federal public lands. However, TRCP's contention that the BLM has violated FLPMA relies entirely on TRCP's unsupported assumption that the sale of the protested parcels will cause unnecessary or undue degradation to the lands underlying the subject parcels. However, nothing in the NEPA analyses the BLM relied on in determining which parcels to include in the sale in any way supports TRCP's assumption, and the TRCP protest provides no evidence to show otherwise. Contrary to TRCP's assumption, the mere issuance of leases does not constitute unnecessary or undue degradation of the public lands. See Colorado Env'tl. Coalition, et al., 165 IBLA 221, 229 (2005) (oil and gas development is not per se unnecessary or undue degradation). Further, for one to show that oil and gas development would have this detrimental effect, one must at a minimum show that a lessee's operations would be conducted in a manner that does not comply with applicable law or regulations, prudent management and practice, or reasonably available technology. See id. at 229. TRCP's mere assumption that leasing of the protested parcels will cause unnecessary or undue degradation is premature and groundless.

TRCP contention: Executive Order 13443, "Facilitation of Hunting Heritage and Wildlife Conservation," Sec. 2 (c) states that federal agencies must, "Manage wildlife and wildlife habitats on public lands in a manner that expands and enhances hunting opportunities, including through the use of hunting in wildlife management planning."

BLM response: Implementation and compliance with Executive Order 13443 is important to the BLM. The past and present cooperative relationship between the BLM and DWR has resulted in exceptional recreational hunting and fishing opportunities throughout the state. The expansion of these opportunities will continue as current partnerships and initiatives, like the Healthy Lands Initiative and the Utah Partnership for Conservation and Development (which work to enhance habitats), move forward. The results of these efforts continue to improve the health of existing habitats and provide for expansion and improvement of habitats for important and sensitive species of wildlife.

In conclusion, for the above-stated reasons, the TRCP protest of the 17 remaining protested parcels is denied.

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 C.F.R. Part 4 and the enclosed Form 1842-1. If an appeal is taken, the notice of appeal must be filed in this office (at the address shown on the enclosed Form) within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.


If you wish to file a petition for a stay pursuant to 43 C.F.R. Part 4, Subpart B, § 4.21, during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay must show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulations, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall be evaluated based on the following standards:

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

Copies of the notice of appeal, petition for stay, and statement of reasons also must be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Office of the Regional Solicitor, Intermountain Region, 125 South State Street, Suite 6201, Salt Lake City, Utah 84138, at the same time the original documents are filed in this office. You will find attached a list of those parties who purchased the subject parcels at the June 2009 lease sale and who therefore must be served with a copy of any notice of appeal, petition for stay, and statement of reasons.



Selma Sierra
State Director

Enclosures

1. Form 1842-1
2. List of Purchasers

cc: James Karkut, Office of the Solicitor, Intermountain Region,
125 South State Street, Suite 6201, Salt Lake City, UT 84138
Bro Energy, LLC, 4824 SO. Highland Circle #205, Salt Lake City, UT 84117
Castle Valley Holdings, LLC, 3300 S. Parker Road, Aurora, CO 80014
Coastal Plains Energy Inc., 420 Throckmorton, #630, Fort Worth, TX 76102-3723
Craig Settle, 897 S. Fulton Way, Greenwood Village, CO 80111-3719
Energy Reserve Group, 150 N. Main St., Suite 233, Salt Lake City, UT 84103
John P. Hollmann, 22619 Brook Drive, Hot Springs, SD 57747
Questar Exploration & Production, 1050 17th St., #500, Denver, CO 80265
Sonja V. McCormick, 1481 S. Preston St., Salt Lake City, UT 84108
Tidewater Oil & Gas Co LLC, 110 16th St., Suite 405, Denver, CO 80202-5206
Wes State Lands, 301 Thelma Dr., #412, Casper, WY 82609-2325

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

INFORMATION ON TAKING APPEALS TO THE INTERIOR BOARD OF LAND APPEALS

DO NOT APPEAL UNLESS

1. This decision is adverse to you,
AND
2. You believe it is incorrect

IF YOU APPEAL, THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES MUST BE FOLLOWED

-
- 1. NOTICE OF APPEAL.....** A person served with the decision being appealed must transmit the notice of appeal in time for it to be filed in the office where it is required to be filed within 30 days after the date of service. If a decision is published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, a person not served with the decision must transmit a notice of appeal in time for it to be filed within 30 days after the date of publication (43 CFR 4.411 and 4.413).
-
- 2. WHERE TO FILE NOTICE OF APPEAL.....** Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, P. O. Box 45155, Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0151 or Bureau of Land Management, Utah State Office, 440 West 200 South, Suite 500, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101
WITH COPY TO SOLICITOR... and
Regional Solicitor, Room 6201, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
-
- 3. STATEMENT OF REASONS** Within 30 days after filing the Notice of Appeal, File a complete statement of the reasons why you are appealing. This must be filed with the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Interior Board of Land Appeals, 801 N. Quincy Street, MS 300-QC, Arlington, Virginia 22203. If you fully stated your reasons for appealing when filing the Notice of Appeal, no additional statement is necessary (43 CFR 4.412 and 4.413).
WITH COPY TO SOLICITOR..... and
Regional Solicitor, Room 6201, 125 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
-
- 4. ADVERSE PARTIES.....** Within 15 days after each document is filed, each adverse party named in the decision and the Regional Solicitor or Field Solicitor having jurisdiction over the State in which the appeal arose must be served with a copy of: (a) the Notice of Appeal, (b) the Statement of Reasons, and (c) any other documents filed (43 CFR 4.413). If the decision concerns the use and disposition of public lands, including land selections under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended, service will be made upon the Associated Solicitor, Division of Land and Water Resources, Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240. If the decision concerns the use and disposition of mineral resources, service will be made upon the Associated Solicitor, Division of Mineral Resources, Office of the Solicitor, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240.
-
- 5. PROOF OF SERVICE.....** Within 15 days after any document is served on an adverse party, file proof of that service with the United States Department of the Interior, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Interior Board of Land Appeals, 801 N. Quincy Street, MS 300-QC, Arlington, Virginia 22203. This may consist of a certified or registered mail "Return Receipt Card" signed by the adverse party (43 CFR 4.401(c)).
-
- 6. REQUEST FOR STAY.....** Except where program-specific regulations place this decision in full force and effect or provide for an automatic stay, the decision becomes effective upon the expiration of the time allowed for filing an appeal unless a petition for a stay is timely filed together with a *Notice of Appeal* (43 CFR 4.21). If you wish to file a petition for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Interior Board of Land Appeals, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal (43 CFR 4.21 or 43 CFR 2804.1). A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the *Notice of Appeal* and Petition for a Stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.
- Standards for Obtaining a Stay. Except as other provided by law or other pertinent regulations, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards: (1) the relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied, (2) the likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits, (3) the likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and (4) whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Unless these procedures are followed your appeal will be subject to dismissal (43 CFR 4.402). Be certain that all communications are identified by serial number of the case being appealed.

NOTE: A document is not filed until it is actually received in the proper office (43 CFR 4.401(a)). See 43 CFR Part 4, subpart b for general rules relating to procedures and practice involving appeals.

43 CFR SUBPART 1821--GENERAL INFORMATION

Sec. 1821.10 Where are BLM offices located? (a) In addition to the Headquarters Office in Washington, D.C. and seven national level support and service centers, BLM operates 12 State Offices each having several subsidiary offices called Field Offices. The addresses of the State Offices can be found in the most recent edition of 43 CFR 1821.10. The State Office geographical areas of jurisdiction are as follows:

STATE OFFICES AND AREAS OF JURISDICTION:

Alaska State Office ----- Alaska
Arizona State Office ----- Arizona
California State Office ----- California
Colorado State Office ----- Colorado
Eastern States Office ----- Arkansas, Iowa, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri
and, all States east of the Mississippi River
Idaho State Office ----- Idaho
Montana State Office ----- Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota
Nevada State Office ----- Nevada
New Mexico State Office ---- New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas
Oregon State Office ----- Oregon and Washington
Utah State Office ----- Utah
Wyoming State Office ----- Wyoming and Nebraska

(b) A list of the names, addresses, and geographical areas of jurisdiction of all Field Offices of the Bureau of Land Management can be obtained at the above addresses or any office of the Bureau of Land Management, including the Washington Office, Bureau of Land Management, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240.

(Form 1842-1, September 2005)

List of Purchasers for TRCP

Bro Energy, LLC
4824 SO. Highland Circle #205
Salt Lake City, UT 84117

Castle Valley Holdings, LLC
3300 S. Parker Road
Aurora, CO 80014

Coastal Plains Energy Inc.
420 Throckmorton, #630
Fort Worth, TX 76102-3723

Craig Settle
5897 S Fulton Way
Greenwood Village, CO 80111-3719

Energy Reserve Group
150 N Main St., Suite 233
Salt Lake City, UT 84103

John P Hollmann
22619 Brook Drive
Hot Springs, SD 57747

Questar Exploration & Production
1050 17th St., #500
Denver, CO 80265

Sonja V. McCormick
1481 S Preston St
Salt Lake City, UT 84108

Tidewater Oil & Gas Co LLC
110 16th St., Suite 405
Denver, CO 80202-5206

Wes State Lands
301 Thelma Dr., #412
Casper, WY 82609-2325