

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

Project Lead: Perry Wickham
Field Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Lead Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Case File/Project Number: NVN 091779
NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0017-DNA
Project Name: Pyramid Materials Asphalt Plant Main Extension
Applicant Name: Sierra Pacific Power Company
Project Location: T.21 N., R.20 E., section 15, Lot 5

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: Sierra Pacific Power Company proposes to construct, maintain, and operate a 500' long, 6" underground polyethylene gas pipeline on BLM lands. The 6" gas main will provide service to an existing asphalt plant located on an already existing BLM lease (NVN 087320). The proposed pipeline shall be constructed within an already highly disturbed area of the existing BLM lease.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

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

Page LND-7 #6 states, "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.

Martin Marietta Materials, Spanish Springs Quarry (DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2011-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?

Yes. The underground pipeline was not a feature included in the original EA, however the project area is within the original project area and was reviewed for biological and cultural resources. No resource conflicts were previously identified.

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. The project is consistent with the other activities currently on-going at the site.

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. There is no new information that would prevent this activity. The project area is highly disturbed, had been previously cleared of historic properties, and is not within greater sage-grouse habitat.

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. This project would contribute a negligible amount of impacts given that the project area is already highly disturbed.

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

Yes. The EA had been made available for 30-days public comment. Notification was also made to the Reno Sparks Indian Colony and State agencies. Two comments from State agencies did not result in any changes to the EA.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Rachel Crews	Archaeologist	BLM
Brian Buttazoni	Planning & Environmental Coordinator	BLM
Perry Wickham	Realty Specialist	BLM

The area was included in the Spanish Springs Quarry area of potential effect. There are no historic resources present.

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

Decision

It is my decision to implement the Pyramid Materials Asphalt Plant Main Extension. I have reviewed this LUP conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the CRMP and that no further NEPA analysis is required.



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

3-4-13

Date

APPEAL PROCEDURES

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with 43 CFR Part 4. If you appeal, your appeal must also be filed with the Bureau of Land Management at the following address:

Leon Thomas
Field Manager, Sierra Front Field Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701

Your appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days from receipt or issuance of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21 (58 FR 4942, January 19, 1993) for a stay (suspension) of the decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to:

Board of Land Appeals
Dockets Attorney
801 N. Quincy Street, Suite 300
Arlington, VA 22203

A copy must also be sent to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor at the same time the original documents are filed with the above office.

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of the Regional Solicitor
Pacific Southwest Region
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1712
Sacramento, CA 95825

If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
2. The likelihood of the appellants' success on the merits.
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted.
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

The Office of Hearings and Appeals regulations do not provide for electronic filing of appeals. Electronically filed appeals will therefore not be accepted.