

DECISION RECORD

Anadarko E&P Onshore LLC, well move and addition of well in the Sahara POD area
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
WY-070-DNA13-304
WY-070-DNA13-305

Buffalo Field Office, Bureau of Land Management

DECISION. The BLM approves Anadarko E&P Onshore LLC’s gas and oil well application for permit to drill (APD) and a Sundry submittal for a well move as described in attached DNA Worksheet pg. 1. This approval includes the both well’s support facilities.

Compliance. This decision complies with:

- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) (43 USC 1701); DOI Order 3310.
- Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 (MLA) (30 U.S.C. 181); to include Onshore Order No. 1.
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 USC 4321).
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) (16 USC 470).
- Buffalo Resource Management Plan (RMP) 1985, Amendments 2001, 2003, 2011.

BLM summarizes the details of the approval of the proposed actions below. This DNA includes the project description.

Well Site. BLM approves the following APD and support facilities:

	Well Name/#	Qtr/Qtr	Section	TWP	RNG	Lease #
1	Mojave Fed 4277-2-41F-XH	NENE	14	42	77	WYW146828

Well Site. BLM approves the following well to be moved (Sundry Submittal).

	Well Name/#	Qtr/Qtr	Section	TWP	RNG	Lease #
1	Mojave Fed 4277-14-34F-H	NENE	14	42	77	WYW146828

THE FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI). Analysis of Alternative B of the EA, WY-070-EA13-72 and the FONSI (incorporated here by reference) found Anadarko’s proposal for the Sahara POD will have no significant impacts on the human environment, beyond those described in the PRB FEIS. There is no requirement for an EIS.

COMMENT OR NEW INFORMATION SUMMARY. BLM publically posted the proposed APD for 30 days, received no comments, and then internally scoped them.

DECISION RATIONALE. BLM bases the decision authorizing the well move and addition of well on the rational contained in DR for Anadarko’s Sahara POD.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEAL. This decision is subject to administrative review according to 43 CFR 3165. Request for administrative review of this decision must include information required under 43 CFR 3165.3(b) (State Director Review), including all supporting documentation. Such

a request must be filed in writing with the State Director, Bureau of Land Management, P.O. Box 1828, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82003, no later than 20 business days after this Decision Record is received or considered to have been received. Parties adversely affected by the State Director's decision may appeal that decision to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, as provided in 43 CFR 3165.4.

Field Manager: *James W. D.*

Date: 9/24/13

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management, Buffalo, WY

OFFICE: BLM, Buffalo Field Office (BFO), 1425 Fort Street, Buffalo, WY 82834

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBERS:

Mojave Fed 4277-2-41F-XH: WY-070-DNA13-305

Mojave Fed 4277-14-34F-H: WY-070-DNA13-304

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE:

Well Move and Well Addition

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T.42N., R.77W., Sec. 14 NENE

APPLICANT : Anadarko E&P Onshore LLC

A. Description of the Proposed Activity and any applicable mitigation measures

The company submitted a Sundry for moving the Mojave Fed 4277-14-34F-H (Sahara POD, permitted 3/5/13, WY-070-EA13-72) and an APD to add an additional well to the permitted location (not constructed). No new disturbance is required; no additional dirt work will be needed for the location or access. The change is required due to new downhole information that has become available since the Sahara POD was approved. The addition of a well to a permitted pad will decrease overall disturbance in the surrounding area by not disturbing new ground with location/access construction.

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

This proposal conforms to the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

LUP: Buffalo Resource Management Plan (RMP), 1985; amended in 2001, 2003, & 2011

The Buffalo RMP, 1985, and as amended in 2001 provides to “Continue to lease and allow development of federal oil and gas in the Buffalo Resource Area” (MM-7: 1985 Buffalo RMP ROD at pg.16, 2001 RMP update at p. 9).

The 2003 supplement to the Buffalo RMP provided goals and objectives for “future management of oil and gas operations....within the Buffalo...RMP areas” 2003 PRB FEIS ROD p. 6.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

- Buffalo FEIS, 1985
- Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) . . . for the Powder River Basin Oil and Gas Project, BFO 2003
- Sahara POD, WY-070-EA13-72, 3/5/13

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

- Powder River Basin Oil and Gas Project Final Biological Opinion (12/17/02, 03/23/2007)
- Buffalo Field Office Wildlife Database, continuously updated
- Buffalo Field Office Cultural Database, continuously updated

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the new proposed activity a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes, the proposed activities are similar if not the same as those proposed and approved in the Sahara POD. The affects/impacts that are associated with an APD, in the Sahara POD, have been analyzed in WY-070-EA13-72 in sections; 2, 3 and 4.

- 2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document for the Sahara POD is appropriate for the new proposed actions.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Yes, the EA for Sahara POD, WY-070-13-72, pp. 8 analyzed for foreseeable activity in the POD area. No new information or circumstances have occurred that would require further analysis not already covered in the existing NEPA documentation.

- 4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?**

Yes, the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementing this proposal are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document of the Sahara POD, pp. 22-39.

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

Yes, the analysis in the EA for the Sahara POD adequately addressed the public involvement and interagency review for an APD proposal.

Note: Refer to the Sahara POD EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original NEPA documents.

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.


Field Manager:

9/24/13
Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.