				13-	1755
Form 3160-5 (August 2007) UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT SUNDRY NOTICES AND REPORTS ON WELLS Do not use this form for proposals to drill or to re-enter an abandoned well. Use form 3160-3 (APD) for such proposals.			FORM APPROVED OMB NO. 1004-0135 Expires: July 31, 2010 5. Lease Serial No. NMNM0560289 6. If Indian, Allottee or Tribe Name 7. If Unit or CA/Agreement, Name and/or No.		
abandoned we					
SUBMIT IN TRIPLICATE - Other instructions on reverse side.					
1. Type of Well Soli Well Gas Well Ot	her			8. Well Name and No BURTON FLAT [DEEP UNIT 57H
2. Name of Operator DEVON ENERGY CORPORA	9. API Well No. 30-015-40829				
3a. Address DEVON ENERGY CORPORA OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 7310	ATION CO. LP 333 WEST SPH	Phone No. (include area code ERIOFARCEOTEDAHOMA C) CITY, OK 73	10. Field and Pool, or 102 450A5 ON,BON	Exploratory E SPRING,EAST
4. Location of Well (Footage, Sec., T., R., M., or Survey Description) Sec 2 T21S R27E 1670FSL 50FWL				11. County or Parish, and State EDDY COUNTY COUNTY, NM	
12. CHECK APP	ROPRIATE BOX(ES) TO IN	DICATE NATURE OF I	NOTICE, RE	EPORT, OR OTHE	R DATA
TYPE OF SUBMISSION		TYPE O	FACTION		
 Notice of Intent Subsequent Report Final Abandonment Notice 13. Describe Proposed or Completed Op 	 Acidize Alter Casing Casing Repair Change Plans Convert to Injection 	 Deepen Fracture Treat New Construction Plug and Abandon Plug Back 	 Reclama Recomp Tempora Water D 	lete arily Abandon isposal	 □ Water Shut-Off □ Well Integrity ☑ Other
Attach the Bond under which the wo following completion of the involved testing has been completed. Final Al determined that the site is ready for f For Records Clean-up, Devor previously approved sundry o Devon requested a SHL Char actually in Section 3. Please r	Energy Production Company n the Burton Flat Deep Unit 57 nge on 11/8/12 and referenced	Sond No. on file with BLM/BIA in a multiple completion or reco ly after all requirements, includ y, L.P. respectfully reques 7H. d the BHL to be in Section	 Required sub ompletion in a n ing reclamation ts to amend 	sequent reports shall be ew interval, a Form 316 , have been completed,	filed within 30 days 0-4 shall be filed once and the operator has
Thank you SEP 1 1 2013					
		9 11/000		L <u></u>	,
14. I hereby certify that the foregoing is	Electronic Submission #21688	RPORATION CO.LP, sent	to the Carlsb	ad	
Name(Printed/Typed) TRINA C (COUCH	Title REGUL	ATORY ASS		
Signature (Electronic S	Submission)	Date 08/13/26	013		
	THIS SPACE FOR F	EDERAL OR STATE	OFFICE US	E	
Approved By Conditions of approval, if any, are attached certify that the applicant holds legal or equ which would entitle the applicant to condu	itable title to those rights in the subje	varrant or	E P S CARLSBAD	FIELD OFFICE	Date 9-6-13
Title 8 U.S.O. Section 1001 and Title 43 States any false, fictitious or fraudulent s	U.S.C. Section 1212, make it a crime statements or representations as to an	for any person knowingly and y matter within its jurisdiction.	willfully to mal	ke to any department or	agency of the United
** OPERAT	OR-SUBMITTED ** OPER	ATOR-SUBMITTED **	OPERATO	DR-SUBMITTED	**

4

Carlsbad Field Office NEPA Checklist

	5-DNA	Proiect Type:			<u></u>	cd Date:	08/30/20
ence Number:NMNM 0560289	£	Proiect Name	BURTON	FLAT DEEP UNIT 57H		outing Started:	08/30/20
t Lead:LYNCH, AMANDA	<i></i>	Applicant:	DEVON E	NERGY PRODUCTION COMPAN	Y	eview Due:	
	PA Coordinate	or Initial Revi	ew 🗆 I	VEPA Coordinator Final Review			
Resource/Activity	Not Present	Not Impacted	**May be Impacted	Reviewer	COAs/Stips Req	Sign Off D	ate
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid*				Lynch, Amanda			
Public Health and Safety				• · · ·		08/30/201	.3
Environmental Justice*				Lynch, Amanda			
General Topography/Surface Geology						08/30/2013	
Prime or Unique Farmlands*							
Lands/Realty, ROW				Lynch, Amanda			
Access/Transportation				·		08/30/201	.3
Vegetation/Forestry							
Livestock Grazing				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/2013	3
Invasive, Non-Native Species*						,,	
Soils						<u> </u>	
Air Quality*				Lynch, Amanda	L	08/30/201	.3
Floodplains*							
Water Quality Surface/Ground*				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/2013	.3
Watershed							
Mineral Materials				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/201	.3
Potash				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/201	.3
Federally Proposed, Threatened or Endangered Species*		Ľ.				<u></u>	
USFWS Concurrence				Lynch, Amanda			
Wetlands/Riparian Zones*							/2013
Special Status Species							
Wildlife Habitat	ī	[]	L.				
Cave/Karst Resources				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/201	3
ACEC's*				Lynch, Amanda		08/30/201	3
Wild/Scenic Rivers*							
Wilderness*				Lynch, Amanda –			
Outdoor Recreation						08/30/2013	3
Visual Resources							
Native American Religious Concerns*	Unk	Unk	Unk				
				Galassini, Stacy		08/30/201	3
Cultural Resources*				12-0717			

* "Critical Element" --- must be addressed in all NEPA documents

*1 May affect \$\$ E, Not likely to be Adversely Affected *2 May affect T&E, likely to be Adversely Affected

** "Affected Element" ---must be addressed in the attached EA Reason for Delay:

.

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

OFFICE:	Carlsbad Field Office
TRACKING NUMBER:	DOI-BLM-NM-P020-2013-17-DNA
CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:	NMNM 0560289
PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:	Burton Flat Deep Unit 57H
LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	Section 2; Township 21 South, Range 27 East
APPLICANT (if any):	Devon Energy Production Company

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

The applicant wishes to amend a previously approved sundry on the above listed well. Devon requested a SHL change on 11/8/12 and referenced the BHL to be in Section 2. The BHL is actually in Section 3. The well location will remain at the approved proposed location. There will be no changes to the original proposed surface use plan of operations.

Mitigation Measures: The previously approved Pecos District Conditions of Approval.

The well location is as follows:

Surface Hole Location: 1670' FSL & 50' FEL, Section 2, T. 21 S., R. 27 E. Bottom Hole Location: 1980' FSL & 330' FWL, Section 2, T. 21 S., R. 27 E.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name*	Carlsbad Resource	Date Approved	September of 1988
	Management Plan (RMP)		
Other document	Carlsbad Approved	Date Approved	October 1997
	Resource Management		
	Plan Amendment (RMPA)		
	and Record of Decision		

* List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

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

October 1997 Carlsbad Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment and Record of Decision, p. 4 which states:

Provide for the leasing, exploration and development of oil and gas resources within the Carlsbad Resource Area. Approximately 3,907,700 acres (95% of the oil and gas mineral estate) will be open to leasing and development under the BLM's standard terms and conditions, the Surface Use and Occupancy Requirements, the Roswell District Conditions of Approval, and the Practices for Oil and Gas Drilling and Operations in Cave and Karst Areas.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Not Applicable

7

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.

Environmental Assessment: NM-P020-2013-0088; Approved 11/01/2012.

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).

Arch. Report #: 12-0717 Cultural Resources: Not Impacted/No Stipulations

Additional project documentation can be reviewed in the case files, available at the Carlsbad Field Office (CFO), for the above well locations.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The proposed action is the same as the originally approved action. There will be no changes to the original proposed well location or surface use plan of operations.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The range of alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents is the same as the new proposed action. The current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values are still the same.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The existing analysis is still valid in light of any new information or circumstances, because the analysis is the same and no changes have been made to health standard assessments, the endangered species listings or sensitive species listed by the BLM. I can reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action at this time.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: The direct, indirect and cumulative effects that would result from implementation or the new proposed action; both quantitatively and qualitatively to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents would remain the same.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA documents still remains adequate for the current proposed action.

Name	Title	Resource/ Agency Represented
Amanda L. Lynch	Natural Resource Specialist	BLM
	Archaeologist	BLM

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

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 (*If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.*)

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.

andle Ina	9.3.13
Signature of Project Lead	Date
Signature of Responsible Official	9-6-13
Signature of Responsible Official	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.