

# Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

OFFICE: Egan Field Office, LLNVL0100

PROJECT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2012-0020-DNA

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Partner with Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) and Barrick Mining Company to install three wildlife water developments (guzzlers) in northern Newark Valley.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T22N, R57E, N 07 (Bourne Canyon), T22N, R57E, W34 (Mooney East), and T22N, R57E, NW 01 (Alligator Ridge West)(Figure , “NDOW/Barrick Project Map” (p. 6))

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

BLM proposes to construct three big game water developments in Newark Valley, White Pine County, west and south of Bald Mountain Mine. Three sites have been identified, they are located at T22N, R57E, N 07 (Bourne Canyon), T22N, R57E, W34 (Mooney East), and T22N, R57E, NW 01 (Alligator Ridge West). BLM proposes to partner with the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW), and Barrick Mining Company to construct these big game wildlife water developments south and west of Bald Mountain Mine. Each water development would consist of four buried tanks with a metal apron fitted with gutters to channel rainwater and snowmelt into the tanks underneath. A separate ground level drinker would be built for each guzzler, with a pipe rail fence consisting of two 1-5/8” steel rails at 24” and 42” above the ground built around them to exclude livestock and wild horses. A four-strand, barbed wire fence would be constructed around the tanks/aprons to prevent damage to the apron from livestock, wildlife, or wild horses. The bottom wire would be barbless. The apron fence would be approximately 10’ wider than the outer edges of the apron. The apron, steel fencing, and any exposed pipe would be left to rust and corrode, thus visually integrating the project into the surrounding environment. The tanks would be hidden underneath the aprons. Barrick Mining Company would provide the materials for the projects and NDOW would install them. Access would be on existing two-track roads and no new road construction would be needed. Installation of the wildlife water developments would result in approximately 1/4 acre of total surface disturbance each. Maintenance of the developments would be the responsibility of NDOW in conformance with a Cooperative Agreement. Access to the sites for subsequent annual inspections and routine maintenance would be on the existing roads.

## **B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

The proposed action is in conformance with the Ely District Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan signed August 20, 2008, which states under Objectives — Fish and Wildlife: “To use wildlife water developments, both natural and artificial, to improve the condition of wildlife habitat, and to use artificial wildlife water developments to mitigate impacts to wildlife species from loss of natural water sources or loss of habitat” (p. 34), and under the following parameters for Wildlife Water Developments: (p 85-86).

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

Identify areas of suitable wildlife habitat that are water limited in coordination with the Nevada Department of Wildlife and interested public (i.e. elk management technical review teams, sportsmen groups, etc.).

**Management Action WL-20 states,**

use the criteria listed below to identify the need for artificial wildlife water developments:

- To mitigate for loss of natural water sources;
- To mitigate for habitat loss or habitat fragmentation
- To reduce inter-specific competition between wildlife, livestock, and wild horses;
- To reduce inter-specific competition between wildlife species; and
- In suitable wildlife habitat that is water limited.

**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.

Name	Date
Ely Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement	November, 2007
DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA Giroux Wash and Horse Range Wildlife Water Developments	December, 2009

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).

Name	Date
Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Bald Mountain Mine North Operations Area Project (identified on a map in this document).	August, 2009

**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 Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA for the Giroux Wash and Horse Range Wildlife Water Developments analyzed the proposed action to “construct a big game water development...”. This new proposed action is considered a feature of, or essentially similar to, the proposed actions analyzed previously. The proposed locations are in similar terrain and resource conditions are similar to those previously analyzed.

**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 value?**

No new alternatives are needed since the project would consist of the same actions based on the alternatives analyzed in DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA and the EA analyzes this type of project in different watersheds where the actual sites are similar.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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?**

The US Fish and Wildlife Service has concluded that the greater sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) is warranted for protection under the Endangered Species Act, however precluded at this time by higher priority species. In compliance with IM WO— 2012–043 the project was vetted with NDOW and the NVSO, due to one of the locations being in PGH; and the project was allowed to proceed. Since sage-grouse habitat was analyzed in DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA, this new information would not 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?**

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects would be similar to those analyzed previously since the action is essentially the same and no new issues/resource concerns have been identified with this new proposed action.

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

DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA included Tribal and Public notifications. A summary of consultation and coordination completed during the DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2009-0018-EA follows:

Letters notifying the interested public and Tribes of the Giroux Wash portion of the Proposed Action were sent May 21, 2009. No issues were expressed during the public scoping period.

Letters notifying the interested public and Tribes of the Horse Range portion of the Proposed Action were sent November 4, 2009. No comments were received.

On November 30, 2009, the final decision on the Giroux Wash and Horse Range Wildlife Water Developments was mailed to the grazing permittees and those publics who have expressed an interest in wildlife actions on the Ely District. No protests or appeals were received.

Additionally, the BLM Egan Field Office Resource Specialists met on December 5, 2011 to scope for additionally resource concerns; none were identified.

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

**Table . List of Preparers**

Name	Title	Resource/Discipline
Amanda Anderson	Rangeland Management Specialist	Rangeland Resources
Mark D'Aversa	Hydrologist	Soil, Air, Water, Riparian/Wetland Areas, Floodplains

**F. 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 requirement of NEPA.

*Marian Little*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Project Lead

*[Signature]*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

*Doris A. McTeague*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the Responsible Official

*8/30/12*  
Date

