

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

---

**Project Lead:** Ken Nelson, Realty Specialist  
**Field Office:** Sierra Front Field Office  
**Lead Office:** Sierra Front Field Office  
**Case File/Project Number:** NVN 025627  
**NEPA NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2012-0007-DNA  
**Project Name:** Pah Rah Communication Site - Right-of-Way Renewal  
**Applicant Name:** Americom Las Vegas  
**Project Location:** East of Sparks – T19N, R21E, Sec. 8, NW¼NW¼ (within).

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

By application received September 24, 2010, Americom Las Vegas applied to renew their right-of-way for the communication facility. No additional improvements to the facility were requested in the application. The renewed right-of-way (Communications Use Lease) should be granted for a term of 20 years, subject to current applicable terms and conditions. The right-of-way may be renewed upon request at the end of the 20 year term.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

*List any applicable LUPs and their dates.*

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

Consolidated Resource Management Plan (May 2001): Lands and Realty, pg. LND -7: Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public.

**Name of Plan:** NV – Carson City RMP

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

Environmental Assessment - NV-030-0-16

**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?

Renewal of existing right-of-way. No new improvements are proposed.

**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?**

The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) are appropriate with respect to the new proposed action.

**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?**

No new information or circumstances was presented in regard to the existing analysis. New information or new circumstances brought forward would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action.

**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?**

No direct, indirect, and cumulative effects would result from implementation of the new proposed action. The proposed action would only renew the existing right-of-way.

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

Public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) are adequate for the current proposed action. No additional public involvement or interagency review is required in regard to the proposed renewal.

#### **E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**


<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Jim Carter	Lead Archaeologist	Sierra Front Field Office

Note: Refer to the EA 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




\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan S. Hockett, Acting Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office

Date 12/30/2011

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.



Easterly view of facility.



View of equipment building.

Photos taken July 28, 2011