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

FIELD OFFICE: Stillwater Field Office, Carson City District

NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2012-0044-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER: ORMAT Federal Geothermal Lease NVN-60686

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: ORMAT Nevada Inc. Sundry Notice – Geotechnical Work

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T22N, R35E, Section 18 E2

APPLICANT: ORMAT Nevada Inc.

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

ORMAT Nevada Inc. has submitted a Sundry Notice to drill three bore holes to evaluate the engineering characteristics of a potential power plant site for their Dixie Hope geothermal project. This work will be completed in advance of a utilization plan submittal. Each bore hole would be eight inches in diameter and would range in depth from thirty to forty feet. Sites would be accessed by overland travel – no new road construction would be required.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan
Date Approved: May 9, 2001

The proposed action is consistent with the applicable land use plan because it is clearly consistent with the following land use plan decisions, objectives, terms, conditions:

Objective 1: Encourage development of energy and mineral resources in a timely manner to meet national, regional and local needs consistent with the objectives for other public land uses.

Objective 2: Oil, gas, and geothermal exploration and production upon BLM land are conducted through leases with the Bureau and are subject to terms and stipulations to comply with all applicable federal and state laws pertaining to various considerations for sanitation, water quality, wildlife, safety, and reclamation. Stipulations may be site specific and are derived from the environmental analysis process.

Objective 3: Geophysical exploration permits for oil, gas, or geothermal resources may be obtained prior to leasing of the lands. Mitigation of any resource conflicts identified in the review process will be stipulated in the permit.
C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Carson City District Office - TGP Dixie Development Company, LLC, Coyote Canyon and Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2010-0010-EA.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action 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?

The proposed action is within the same project area analyzed in the TGP Dixie Development Company, LLC, Coyote Canyon and Dixie Meadows Geothermal Exploration Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2010-0010-EA. The location for the proposed bore holes is outside but adjacent to the area analyzed in the 2010 EA. The area where boreholes are proposed has similar resource characteristics. Drilling shallow geotechnical bore holes is similar to other forms of exploration drilling analyzed in the 2010 EA, but involves far less surface disturbance.

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, environmental concerns, interests and resource values have not changed at all since the completion of the 2010 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2010 EA is still appropriate since the environmental constraints of the geothermal exploration have not changed. The proposed action, geotechnical borings, is similar to other forms of exploration drilling analyzed in the 2010 EA, but involves far less surface disturbance than those analyzed.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, range-land 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 anticipated impacts to the resources have not changed. The proposed site uses an existing access road and minimal overland travel. The proposed action will not have any adverse effect on the human health or environment and is similar to actions analyzed in the 2010 EA.

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 2010 EA analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources. The cumulative impacts to public lands resulting from geothermal exploration would remain unchanged because the area in question is similar to that analyzed in the 2010 EA. Additionally, the nature of the proposed action involves less disturbance than the proposed actions analyzed in the 2010 EA.

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

Yes, the geothermal resource exploration operations were analyzed in the 2010 EA which describes the public involvement. Consultation with other agencies and interested parties was conducted for that document. The Fallon Paiute-Shoshone Tribe will be notified via letter of the proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Resource/Agency Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jason Wright</td>
<td>Stillwater Archaeologist</td>
<td>BLM Carson City District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.
Conclusion
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.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of Responsible Official

Date 07/25/2011

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.