

**DECISION RECORD**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA), WY-070-DNA 13-255**  
**EOG Resources, Inc., Project 785, Crossbow 67-0629H**  
**Bureau of Land Management, Buffalo, WY**

**DECISION.** BLM approves EOG Resource Inc. (EOG) Project 785., Crossbow 67-0629H, 1 oil well application for permit to drill (APD) via the DNA worksheet, WY-070-DNA13-255, both incorporated here by reference. The DNA tiers to EOG Project 808 Environmental Assessment (EA), WY-070-EA11-284 and EOG Project 785 EA, WY-070-EA10-238. The DNA proposal is the result of collaboration between the BLM and EOG. This approval includes the 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, and Amendments.

Details of the approval are summarized below. The project description, including specific changes made at the onsites is in the DNA worksheet, and in EAs, WY-070-EA11-284 and WY-070-EA10-238.

**Well Site.** BLM approves the following 1 APD and support infrastructure:

#	Well Name & #	Qtr	Sec	Twp	Rng	Lease #s
1	Crossbow 67-0629H	NENE	6	41N	71W	SHL-WYW106828 BHL-WYW140770

SHL – surface hole lease; BHL – bottom hole lease

**Limitations.** See the site-specific conditions of approval (COAs).

**THE FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI).** The APD analyzed in the DNA worksheet was found to have no significant impacts on the human environment, beyond those described in the Powder River Basin Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRB FEIS), thus an EIS or EA is not required. The FONSI for EAs, WY-070-EA11-284 and WY-070-EA10-238 cover this proposal since the effects received analysis and there is no new surface disturbance.

**COMMENT OR NEW INFORMATION SUMMARY.** BLM publically posted the proposed APD for 30 days, received no comments, and then internally scoped them. BLM experience in the PRB (outside of the Fortification Creek Planning Area) revealed little public input or new issue discovery other than those revealed after public scoping during development of the PRB FEIS. Since receipt of the APD, BLM received clarified policies on migratory bird and Greater Sage-Grouse (GSG) conservation.

**DECISION RATIONALE.** BLM bases the decision authorizing the selected project on:

1. BLM and EOG included mitigation measures to reduce environmental impacts while meeting the BLM’s need. For a description of all site-specific COAs see the COAs. The PRB FEIS analyzed and predicted that the PRB oil and gas development would have significant impacts to the region’s GSG population. The impact of this development cumulatively contributes to the potential for local GSG extirpation yet its effect is acceptable because it is outside priority habitats and is within the parameters of the PRB FEIS and ROD and current BLM and Wyoming GSG conservation strategies.
2. EOG will conduct operations to minimize adverse effects to surface and subsurface resources, prevent

unnecessary surface disturbance, and conform to currently available technology and practice. The operator incorporated several measures to alleviate resource impacts into their Master Surface Use Plan (MSUP), submitted on November 18, 2013. Refer to the MSUP pp. 1-11, for complete details of operator committed measures. All disturbances are on existing infrastructure, no new disturbance is anticipated. BLM's analysis, finding (FONSI), and rationale are ground in EOG Project 808 EA, WY-070-EA11-284, and in EOG Project 785 EA, WY-070-EA10-238.

3. The selected alternative will help meet the nation's energy needs, and help stimulate local economies by maintaining workforce stability.
4. The Operator committed to:
  - Comply with the approved APD, applicable laws, regulations, orders, and notices to lessees.
  - Obtain necessary permits from agencies.
  - Offer water well agreements to the owners of record for permitted wells.
  - Incorporate several measures to alleviate resource impacts into their submitted surface use plan and drilling plan.
5. The Operator certified it has a surface access agreement or posted a 43 CFR 3814.1 bond.
6. This APD area is clearly lacking wilderness characteristics as there is no federal surface.
7. This APD is pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for the purpose of exploring or developing oil or gas and do not satisfy the categorical exclusion directive of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, Section 390 because BLM and EOG anticipate no new surface disturbance.

**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: 

Date: 12/5/13

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet, WY-070-DNA13-255  
Bureau of Land Management, Buffalo, WY**

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

CASE FILE/PROJECT NUMBERS: EOG Project 785, WY-070-DNA13-255

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE: EOG Project 785, Crossbow 67-0629H

LOCATION/LLEGAL DESCRIPTION: see below

APPLICANT: EOG Resources, Inc. (EOG)

**A. Description of the Proposed Activity and Any Applicable Mitigation Measures**

The proposal is 1 application for permit to drill (APD), the Crossbow 67-0629H, located in the NENE of Section 6, T41N, R71W. EOG Resources, Inc. (EOG) proposes to explore for and develop oil and natural gas reserves underlying 1 federal oil and gas lease, surface hole lease, WYW106828 and bottom hole lease, WYW140770, leased by EOG in southern Campbell County, Wyoming. EOG proposes to drill, complete, produce, and eventually reclaim bores to the Turner Formation. Associated infrastructure would include access roads, gathering lines, and possible future power lines required for access to the well pad and transport of oil and gas from the well sites. This well will be on an existing well pad with the Crossbow 20-06H producing well. All disturbance is on existing infrastructure; no new disturbance is anticipated. EOG anticipates the life of a productive well to be up to 40 years. Federal lands split jurisdiction rules apply for the surface is non-federal overlying federal mineral lease.

**Well List:**

#	Well Name & #	Qtr	Sec	Twp	Rng	Lease #s
1	Crossbow 67-0629H	NENE	6	41N	71W	SHL-WYW106828 BHL-WYW140770

SHL – surface hole lease; BHL – bottom hole lease

The 785 Project area and this APD are in an existing coalbed natural gas production area on lands owned by private landowners, and the State of Wyoming administered surface lands. Mineral ownership is a combination of federal, State of Wyoming, and private. The BLM has previously completed NEPA documents and issued FONSI covering 117 wells on 49 pads in the project area for EOG. The Wyoming Oil and Gas Conservation Commission approved APDs for wells in the project area on fee and state leases. Some of the previously approved wells are drilled, completed, and are in production. Others are planned for drilling and completion in 2013 and 2014.

EOG submitted this well as notice of staking (NOS) at the time of the analysis occurred for environmental assessment (EA), WY-070-EA10-238. EOG subsequently converted the NOS to an APD. The conditions and environmental effects found in the EA are substantially unchanged and remain valid. The APD was posted for the required 30 days and now can be approved.

For complete details of surface disturbance see EOG Project 785 POD MUSP and section 3 and 4 of the associated EOG Project 785 EA, WY-070-EA10-238.

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

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

LUP: Buffalo Resource Management Plan (RMP), 1985, and Amendments. DOI Order 3310.

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 Record Of Decision (ROD) at p.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 Final Environmental Impact Statement (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.

- EOG Project 785, WY-070-EA10-238
- EOG Project 808, WY-070-EA11-284
- Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Proposed Plan Amendments for the Powder River Basin Oil and Gas Project, BFO 2003

**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 action is similar to the actions proposed in the approved project and the Crossbow 67-0629H well fall within disturbed areas which were approved for use in EOG Project 785.

The Crossbow 67-0629H well was analyzed in the EOG Project 785, WY-070-EA10-238, which BLM tiers to and incorporates here by reference.

EOG submitted this well as a NOS at the time the analysis occurred for EAs, WY-070-EA10-238 and WY-070-EA11-284. As a NOS it was intermingled with proposed APDs and on the same well pad with proposed APDs – thus received BLM’s analysis. EOG subsequently converted the NOS to an APD. The conditions and environmental effect found in the EA are substantially unchanged and remain valid.

A 30 day posting is required prior to approval. The APD was posted for the required 30 days and now can be approved.

- 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, Crossbow 67-0629H well’s range of alternatives was analyzed in the EOG Project 785, WY-070-EA10-238, and similarly in EOG Project 808, WY-070-EA11-284 (incorporated here by reference).

- 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 EOG Project 785, WY-070-EA10-238, analyzed foreseeable activity, particularly the notices of staking that were active at the time the EA's analysis. Any new information or circumstances did not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action. The EA's and APD's master surface use plan and drilling plan are incorporated here by reference and show adequate protection of surface lands and ground water. This includes EOG's Addendum to Drill Plan, July 14, 2011 and the protections for the Fox Hills Formation. BLM recommends approval of EOG's requests for variances as recognized industry practices in the PRB.

**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, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts are unchanged from those identified/analyzed in the existing NEPA documentation.

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

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review associated with the EOG Project 785 EA and this DNA worksheet are adequate for the current proposed action. BLM received no public comments from posting the APD for 30 days.

**E. BLM Staff Consulted**

Name	Title	Organization
Meleah Corey	Natural Resource Specialist, Project Lead	BLM
Scott Jawors	Wildlife Biologist	BLM
Clint Crago	Archeologist	BLM
Buck Damone	Archeologist	BLM
Casey Freise	Natural Resource Specialist	BLM
John Kelley	Environmental and Planning NEPA Coordinator	BLM

Note: Refer to the EOG Project 785, WY-070-EA10-238, for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

**Conclusion**

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.



Signature of the Buffalo Field Manager:



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.