

# United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

---

## Finding of No New Significant Impacts Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2012-0048-EA

---

November 2012

### November 2012 Oil and Gas Lease Sale

Location: Price Field Office  
Carbon County, Utah

Applicant/Address: U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Utah State Office  
440 West 200 South, Suite 500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

---

Utah State Office  
440 West 200 South, Suite 500  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Office (801) 539-4001  
FAX (801) 539-4237



**Finding of No New Significant Impact  
Environmental Assessment  
DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2012-0048-EA**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis<sup>1</sup> (EA) (DOI-BLM-UT-G021-2012-0048-EA) in order to address one lease parcel nominated within the BLM Price Field Office (PFO) for the November 2012 Oil and Gas Lease Sale, consisting of 480 acres in Carbon County.

In processing the expressions of interest filed with this office, the BLM considered the leasing of 202,155 acres (136 parcels). As identified in the Notice of Competitive Oil and Gas Lease Sale (issued on August 14, 2012), 20 parcels consisting of 22,532.30 acres were offered. By erratum issued on October 15, 2012, parcel UT025 was withdrawn from further consideration. In the October 25, 2012 erratum, parcels UT015, UT019, UT020, and UT042 were deferred. Parcel UT032 was split into two parcels (UT032 and UT032A) in order to accommodate a unit joiner. Ultimately, 16 parcels consisting of 18,789.69 acres were offered at the November 13, 2012 quarterly oil and gas lease auction.

This Finding of No New Significant Impact<sup>2</sup> (FONNSI) addresses 1 of these 16 parcels covering 480 acres (Parcel UT016). A separate Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI) will be made in regard to the other 15 parcels (18,309.69 acres).

Parcel UT016 occurs within the project area analyzed within the West Tavaputs Natural Gas Full-Field Development Plan Environmental Impact Statement (Record of Decision issued in July 2010, UT-070-05-055).

As documented in the Deferred Lands List,<sup>3</sup> parcels were deferred based on consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and affected Native American tribes and management needs of the cultural resources, wildlife (management area, greater sage-grouse habitat and prairie dog habitat), & recreation programs as well as coordination with special interest groups. Specifically, 80 acres were deferred from parcel UT016 in order to address cultural resource concerns.

This action provides for the orderly development of fluid mineral resources under the BLM's jurisdiction in a manner consistent with multiple use management and environmental consideration for the resources that are present. Adequate provisions are included with the leases to protect public health and safety and assure full compliance

---

<sup>1</sup> The BLM also completed two other EAs [DOI-BLM-UT-C020-2011-043-EA and DOI-BLM-UT-G010-2012-174-EA] which address nominated parcels within the Richfield (RFO) and Vernal (VFO) Field Offices.

<sup>2</sup> In accordance with 43 CFR 46.140, a FONNSI is prepared because the current analysis tiers to the Record of Decision for the West Tavaputs Plateau Natural Gas Full Field Development Plan Environmental Impact Statement.

<sup>3</sup> Deferred Lands List is available online at:

[http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/ut/lands\\_and\\_minerals/oil\\_and\\_gas/november\\_2012.Par.84760.File.dat/Deferred%20Lands.pdf](http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/ut/lands_and_minerals/oil_and_gas/november_2012.Par.84760.File.dat/Deferred%20Lands.pdf)

with the objectives of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as amended and other federal environmental laws and regulations.

Continued leasing is necessary to maintain options for exploration of oil and gas as companies seek new areas for production or attempt to locate and develop previously unidentified, inaccessible or uneconomical reserves.

The sale of oil and gas leases will assist the growing energy needs of the United States public. The underlying need for the proposal has been met while accomplishing the following objectives:

1. Lease where in conformance with the BLM land use plans and consistent with state and local plans.
2. Protect important wildlife habitats.
3. Protect Traditional Cultural Properties and Indian sacred sites.
4. Mitigate impacts on other resource values, including air quality, fossil resources, fragile soils, steep slopes, high country watersheds, streams, springs and noxious weeds.

### **FINDING OF NO NEW SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that leasing parcel UT016, will not have a significant effect on the human environment beyond those already analyzed and disclosed in the West Tavaputs (WTP) Natural Gas Full-Field Development Plan Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (July 2010). After evaluating the WTP EIS, I have determined that it fully analyzed the effects of development on the abovementioned parcel and that there are no new circumstances or information that would substantially change the analysis.

No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects described in the Final EIS prepared for the PFO Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) (2008, as maintained) or those presented in the WTP Final EIS. The November 2012 Lease Sale EA tiers to and incorporates by reference, the analysis contained in supporting documents as identified in EA section 1.5. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed.

This finding is based on the context and intensity of the proposal as described:

**Context:** The November 13, 2012 lease sale included 480 acres of BLM administered lands within the WTP project area (parcel UT016) that by itself does not have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance.

As stated in the WTP ROD (page i), the contracted development plan, as modified, provided for natural gas exploration and development while mitigating impacts on key resources including cultural resources in Nine Mile Canyon, sensitive landscapes, wildlife resources, and air quality in the Uinta Basin and southeastern Utah. The requirements identified within the ROD apply to all operators and their successors. A summary of the measures that the BLM has adopted are contained in the ROD's attachment 2.

The BLM estimated the surface disturbance for all significant reasonably foreseeable oil and gas activities within the WTP project area during a 20 year period. The BLM verified these projections again during the preparation of this EA. The BLM specifically incorporated air quality and emissions inventory from the analysis contained in the air quality studies prepared for the Greater Natural Buttes and the WTP Plateau projects.

The WTP EIS analyzed development on leased and unleased lands. Within the range of alternatives considered in the WTP EIS, there were a total of 219 wells from 146 well pads analyzed on unleased lands. However, none of these wells or well pads were approved in the ROD.

All resource values addressed in Chapter 3 were evaluated for cumulative effects. The inclusion of stipulations and notices the parcel yields no net effects to the cumulative impact area.

**Intensity:** The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27 and incorporated into resources and issues considered (includes supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1) and supplemental Instruction Memorandum, Acts, regulations and Executive Orders. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

**1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.** The proposed leasing would impact resources as described in the EA. Mitigating measures to reduce impacts to other natural resources were incorporated in the leases and were based on decisions within the ROD/RMP and protective measures incorporated from the Greater Natural Buttes EIS and the WTP ROD.

Collectively, these formed the resource protection measures identified in the EA. None of the environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA and associated appendices are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed those described in the existing NEPA documentation for leasing. Should the offered parcel be developed it may contribute to local and regional energy supplies. Additional, site-specific NEPA analysis and further mitigation to reduce environmental impacts will be required at the Application for Permit to Drill (APD) stage.

The WTP ROD states (page 27): as part of the Proposed Action and Alternatives, the BLM evaluated the potential impacts of development on leased and unleased lands in the WTP Project Area as well as the impacts of development on private and State lands. While the EIS provided an analysis of development on unleased lands it did not approve any of that development on any unleased lands. The ROD also does not include a decision to lease or under what conditions to lease any specific parcel within the WTP Project Area, and does not modify leasing decisions in the PFO Approved RMP. If parcels are nominated for leasing through the BLM's competitive leasing process, the environmental impact analysis contained in the WTP EIS may fulfill the BLMs obligations to conduct environmental analysis and identify measures that mitigate impacts after the lease is issued and for regional issues such as air quality.

**2. The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.** Leasing for oil and gas and subsequent exploration and development is an on-going activity on public lands. With the stipulations and lease notices attached to the

leases and the additional NEPA analysis and potential protections applied at the APD stage, they will be developed in a way that protects public health and safety. For example, spill prevention plans will be required; drilling operations will be conducted under the safety requirements of Federal Onshore Oil and Gas Orders, and recommended practices of the American Petroleum Institute, including blow-out preventers, well bore casings and other industry safety requirements to protect workers and public health. Environmentally responsible oil and gas operations, including health and safety, are outlined within EA section 4.2 (General Analysis Assumptions and Guidelines). As such, all operations, including well pad and road construction, water handling, and plugging and abandonment will be conducted following the “Gold Book” Surface Operating Standards for Oil and Gas Exploration and Development. As stated, the Gold Book provides operators with a combination of guidance and standards for ensuring compliance with agency policies and operating requirements, such as those found at 43 CFR 3000 and 36 CFR 228 Subpart E; Onshore Oil and Gas Orders (Onshore Orders); and Notices to Lessees. Included in the Gold Book are environmental best management practices; these measures are designed to provide for safe and efficient operations while minimizing undesirable impacts to the environment. For example, handling of produced water is addressed in Onshore Oil and Gas Order No. 7, which prescribes measures required for the protection of surface and ground water sources. During reclamation, if the fluids within the reserve pit have not evaporated within 90 days, the fluid would be pumped from the pit and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.

**3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to cultural resources and Traditional Cultural Properties, recreation, visual resources, vegetation, and wildlife.** Existing records regarding cultural resources indicate that the density of cultural resources is such that it is likely that a well pad could be located on each of the lease parcels including those within the WTP project area without adverse effects on cultural resources.

On June 21, 2012, the Utah State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with a determination of “No Adverse Effect” on historic properties for this lease sale.

As stated in the WTP ROD (page 35): through development and implementation of the Programmatic Agreement (PA), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the SHPO have agreed that the BLM has fulfilled its statutory obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). In addition to the aforementioned operator commitments, as part of the PA, the BLM has committed to development of a site stewardship program for the Nine Mile Canyon area, and to submitting eligible properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The signing of the WTP PA on January 5, 2010 by all parties and its implementation concluded the Section 106 process.

The WTP ROD (page 36) also states that the Selected Alternative contains a number of design features and mitigation measures which will decrease the amount of project related traffic in Nine Mile Canyon, thereby reducing potential impacts to cultural resources. These measures include but are not limited to:

- provision of temporary worker housing;

- as feasible, disposal of produced water within the WTP Project Area (SWD wells and water management facilities);
- reuse of water for drilling and completion activities;
- where feasible, construction of water/condensate transfer lines;
- provision of new and improved airstrips for aerial transportation; and
- where feasible, use of telemetry equipment (remote monitoring) at well locations.

The WTP ROD (page 29) concluded that: “After a thorough review of other decisions contained within the Approved RMP, the BLM has determined that the Selected Alternative does not conflict with other decisions contained within the plan such as management decisions for the Nine Mile Canyon ACEC, SRMA, or the BLM Backcountry Byway; the Desolation Canyon NHL or SRMA, BLM natural areas, WSAs, WSRs, or other natural resources.”

As stated in the EA at section 3.3.4, the Approved Resource Management Plan, October 2008, Record of Decision, determined that Price River Unit non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics would not be managed for those characteristics based upon the analysis in the Price Proposed Plan/Final EIS (2008). The Price River Unit is located in an oil and gas development area with a moderate to high potential for future development (BLM, 2008b). Development activity provisions are outlined in the WTP ROD. Lease notice UT-LN-97 was added to notify a potential lessee that additional provisions would be applied at the APD stage.

There are no other unique characteristics within or adjacent to the parcel.

The following resources and uses considered (including supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1) are not affected because they are not present in the project area: BLM Natural Areas, Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Floodplains, Wild and Scenic Rivers and Wilderness/WSA.

In addition, the following resources and uses considered (including supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1), although present, would not be affected by this proposed action for the reasons listed in Appendix C of the EA: Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, BLM Sensitive Animal Species, Coal, Cultural Resources, Environmental Justice, Fuels/Fire Management, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Geology/Mineral Resources/Energy Production, Invasive Plants/Noxious Weeds, Soils, and Vegetation, Lands/Access, Livestock Grazing, Native American Religious Concerns, Paleontology, Rangeland Health Standards, Recreation, Socio-Economics, Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species, Visual Resources, Wastes, (hazardous or solid), Water/Quality (drinking/ground), Wetlands/Riparian Zones, Wild Horses and Burros, Woodland/Forestry, Vegetation including Special Status Plant Species Other Than FWS Candidate or Listed Species, Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFWS Listed Species and Sensitive species, e.g. Migratory Birds.

The Interdisciplinary Team Checklist (Appendix C of the EA) contains the specialists’ determinations and rationale for those elements not present or impacted by the proposal. Issues including changes brought forward by public comment or internal review are discussed at EA sections 1.6, 5.3, 5.3.1, and 5.3.2 and within Appendix D (Comment

Response Table). Significance thresholds were not exceeded for any resource or use of the public land.

The stipulations and notices added to the parcel including standard lease terms under the Onshore Oil and Gas Lease Orders, those developed in the PFO ROD/RMP and those recommended in this EA, take into account the resource values and appropriate management constraints prescribed in the Price ROD/RMP, as maintained.

**4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** Scientific controversy over the nature of the impacts does not exist. The oil and gas exploration and development that could follow leasing is a routine practice on public lands. The nature of the activities and the resultant impacts are well understood and have been adequately analyzed and disclosed to the public through the existing BLM NEPA documents and within the EA.

**5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** As stated above, leasing and subsequent exploration and development of oil and gas is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing the oil and gas program and the environmental effects to the human environment are fully analyzed in existing NEPA documents and within the EA. Therefore, there are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

**6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** Reasonably foreseeable actions connected to the decision to lease have been considered. As stated in the description of the proposed action within EA, a lessee's right to explore and drill for oil and gas, at some location on Standard Stipulation and Controlled Surface Stipulation leases, is implied by issuance of the lease. A lessee must submit an application for permit to drill (APD) identifying the specific location and drilling plan to the BLM for approval and must possess a BLM-approved APD prior to drilling. An appropriate NEPA document is prepared prior to approval of the APD.

Following the BLM's approval of an APD, a lessee may produce oil and gas from a lease with BLM oversight. Operational changes require additional approvals. The impacts which may result from oil and gas development from leasing the parcels included in the selected alternative were considered by an interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and, as stated below, significant cumulative effects are not predicted.

**7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership.** The interdisciplinary team evaluated the possible actions in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete disclosure of the effects, including cumulative effects, of leasing the subject parcel is contained in Chapter 4 of the EA.

The EA establishes that increased surface disturbance relating to future potential operational authorizations relating to the Proposed Action alternative (leasing nominated parcels with recommended protective measures) may impact air quality, hydrologic conditions, threatened, endangered or candidate plant & animal species and non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics.

It is anticipated that the additional resource protection measures associated with the Proposed Action would reduce the impacts to specific resources and areas within the cumulative impact analysis area (CIA). The minimal amount of disturbance associated with the expected level of development in the CIA, in combination with Gold Book standard operating practices, best management practices, and additional measures that would minimize development impacts, would result in a negligible cumulative impact on the resources within the CIA.

**8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.** Leasing of the parcel included in the selected alternative will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, nor will it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. As discussed in item 3 above, consultation with SHPO has been completed in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA and the SHPO has concurred with a “No Adverse Effect” on historic properties determination. Given the requirements of the oil and gas lease orders, the land use plan and the other stipulations placed on the leases, significant scientific, cultural or historical resources would not be significantly affected. In addition, the following has been included as a formal stipulation [Washington Office (WO) Instruction Memorandum (IM) 2005-003] on the lease parcel:

*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.*

Paiute Tribe of Utah, Ute Indian Tribe, Hopi Tribe, Zuni Tribe, Navaho Nation, Ute Mountain Tribe, Southern Ute Tribe, Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation, Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, and Eastern Shoshone Tribe were notified via certified letter on June 25, 2012. Based on the information received, the BLM has determined that the November 2012 Oil and Gas Lease offering has no potential to affect Tribes or Traditional Cultural Properties (EA at Appendix C).

In consulting with the affected Tribes, the BLM deferred 80 acres to accommodate additional discussions with the Tribes or protect cultural resources.

The WTP ROD (page 45) states the following regarding consultation with Native Americans: twenty-seven Native American Tribal organizations were invited to formally participate as consulting parties to the EIS. No Tribe elected to participate; however, Government to Government Tribal consultation has been ongoing throughout the NEPA process. A summary of Native American Consultation is included Chapter 6 of the WTP Final EIS. A complete history of Tribal consultation can be found in the Proposed WTP

Plateau Natural Gas Full Field Development Plan Native American Consultation and Identification of Traditional Cultural Places (Summit Applied Anthropology 2008), which is contained in the administrative record for this project.

**9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, or the degree to which the action may adversely affect: 1) a proposed to be listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat, or 2) a species on the BLM's sensitive species list.** The BLM requested formal consultation on July 21, 2008 through a Biological Assessment (BA) as part of the planning process for the RMP. The US Fish and Wildlife Service return a Biological Opinion and Conference Opinion (BO) based on the information provided in the BA on October 23, 2008. The lease notices were originally developed as part of a statewide programmatic Section 7 consultation with the USFWS for leasing dated December 13, 2004 and returned from the USFWS on December 16, 2004 concurring with the BLM's finding of "not likely to adversely affect" for leasing were included and excepted in the BO. Additional programmatic consultation occurred for the California condor in June, 2008 and one for Canada lynx in April, 2007 since they were not undertaken as part of the original state programmatic consultation effort in 2004. In both consultations, the BLM committed to attaching to the appropriate lease notices that were designed to manage and protect specific listed species in conjunction with the authority of the ESA and the Standard Terms and Conditions of an oil and gas lease. The BLM and USFWS have agreed upon the language of the lease notice which will notify lessees of specific species that require protection under the ESA. As per the BO prepared for the Price Field Office RMP (as maintained), the USFWS also concurred with the application of the respective stipulations applied for the protection of listed species.

In addition, the following has been included as a formal stipulation (WO IM 2002-174) on all of the lease parcels subject to this sale:

*The lease may now and hereafter contain plants, animals, and their habitats determined to be threatened, endangered, or other special status species. The BLM may recommend modifications to exploration and development proposals to further its conservation and management objectives to avoid BLM approved activity that will contribute to a need to list such a species or their habitat. The BLM may require modification 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. The BLM will not approve any ground-disturbing activity that may affect any such species or critical habitat until it completes its obligation under 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.*

The WTP ROD (page 46) states the following regarding Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act: in addition to the USFWS being actively involved in the WTP project as a Cooperating Agency, the BLM formally consulted with the Service in accordance with Section 7 of the ESA, which requires Federal agencies to evaluate their actions with respect to any species that are proposed or listed as endangered or threatened, and their critical habitat, if any has been formally designated.

The WTP ROD continues with: based on an agreement between the BLM and the USFWS, the information on threatened, endangered, and candidate species the WTP EIS was used as the Biological Assessment for this project. The USFWS' Biological Opinion (BO) (Attachment 9) concurred with the BLM's findings for threatened, endangered, and candidate species within the WTP Project Area based on the Alternative E - Agency Preferred Alternative contained in the WTP Final EIS. The final BO was signed by the USFWS prior to signing this ROD (June 14, 2010), thereby formally concluding the Section 7 Consultation process.

The WTP ROD concludes with: the USFWS has concurred that potential impacts to all listed species and their habitats are less under the Selected Alternative than those analyzed in the Agency Preferred Alternative in the WTP Final EIS (also considered the Biological Assessment for this project) (see Attachment 9). All of the measures identified by the USFWS in the BO have been included in this decision as committed mitigation (see Attachment 2).

The preliminary parcel list for the lease sale was sent to the USFWS on March 16, 2012. As such, the USFWS concurred with a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" determination and the applicable stipulations and notices for the Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Drainage Basin, Mexican Spotted Owl, Clay Reed-Mustard, San Rafael Cactus, Uinta Basin Hookless Cactus and the Wright Fishhook Cactus on August 31, 2012.

Since appropriate stipulations and lease notices for protection of plant and wildlife including special status species have been identified, as incorporated through interdisciplinary and interagency efforts, the BLM has concluded that plant and animal species would not be adversely affected.

**10. Whether the action threatens a violation of a federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment, where non-federal requirements are consistent with federal requirements.** The sale of the parcels included in the November 13, 2012 lease sale does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. State, local, and tribal interests were given the opportunity to participate in the environmental assessment process.

Considerable discussions regarding the management and protection of air quality were implemented within the WTP ROD. As detailed within pages 37 – 41, The BLM has incorporated a number of mitigation measures into the Selected Alternative which were analyzed under the Agency Preferred Alternative that will reduce impacts to air quality. These measures include:

- Tier II rig standards will be required for all new and re-located rigs.
- All new and replaced pneumatic controllers will be a no bleed or low bleed design.
- Emission controls will be utilized on all condensate storage batteries with emissions greater than 5 tons/year. This will include all tank batteries located at well sites, centralized production facilities and compressor stations. The emission controls may consist of vapor recovery, thermal oxidation or other available

technologies. At a minimum, the applied control technology must be capable of reducing emissions by 95 percent.

- BMPs will be employed during completion operations to minimize emissions to the atmosphere as a result of well flowback. The preferential BMP shall be “Green Completion” where the well flowback is captured, separated, and sold as product. When Green Completions are not technically reasonable, flaring or other control practices shall be employed to minimize venting emissions directly to the atmosphere.
- Emissions from engines will be controlled utilizing BACT in accordance with UDAQ regulations. Emissions controls may consist of lean-burn technology, catalysts, air/fuel ratio controllers or other technologies as they become commercially available. Engines located at facilities outside of UDAQ jurisdiction (EPA jurisdiction) will be controlled in a like manner.

In accordance with a UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008, requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures and compressor engines; the BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation or Condition of Approval for APDs:

- All new and replaced internal combustion oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms [grams] of NOx per horsepower-hour. This requirement does not apply to oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower.
- All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms [grams] of NOx per horsepower-hour.

Based on the emissions estimates and consideration of the parcel locations relative to population centers and Class 1 areas, no significant air resource impacts are anticipated. Detailed analysis or modeling is not warranted.

The project is consistent with applicable land management plan, policies, and programs as indicated in Chapter 1, Relationship to Statutes, Regulations and Other Plans, included in the EA. Additional consultation and coordination will be required during review and approval of site-specific proposals for oil and gas exploration, drilling and development.



Authorized Officer

1/18/2013

Date

bcc: Lease Sale Book Nov2012  
Reading File: UT-910, UT-930  
Central Files UT-950

UT922 pschuller:FONNSI 1112 1/14/13