

**PROGRAM CONSULTATION & COORDINATION/DNA CHECKLIST**  
**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**  
**TUCSON FIELD OFFICE**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

Office: Tucson Field Office

NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0022-DNA  
Case/Project No.: AZA 35609

Project Name: Existing 6" water line across proposed Three Points Fire District land sale

Case/Project No.: AZA 35609

Location (legal description): T 16 S., R. 10 E., Section 4, Lots 17 & 18

NLCS Unit: N/A

Quad Name: Three Points

Project Lead: Linda Dunlavey

Technical Review:

Criteria Applies?	NAME	CRITERIA	SIGNATURE	DATE
Yes No			Nepa Team	5/20/2013
(X) ( )		(1) The new proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.		
(X) ( )		(2) A reasonable range of alternatives to the new proposed action was analyzed in the document being reviewed.		
(X) ( )		(3) The information or circumstances upon which the document being reviewed are based are still valid and germane to the new proposed action.		
(X) ( )		(4) The methodology and analytical approach used in the document being reviewed is appropriate for the new action.		
(X) ( )		(5) The direct and indirect impacts of the new proposed action do not significantly differ from, or essentially the same as, those identified in the document being reviewed.		
(X) ( )		(6) The new proposed action, if implemented, would not significantly change the cumulative impact analysis..		
(X) ( )		(7) Public involvement in the document being reviewed provides suitable coverage for the new proposed action..		

Final Review:

Manager/Supervisor: Daniel Moore Date: 6/3/2013

Environmental Coordinator: Claire Crow Date: 6/4/2013



**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing EA for the land sale was written to include all existing right-of-way's in the area the 1988 Phoenix RMP, allows issuance of ROW grants or renewals.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes, the range of alternatives in the existing NEPA documents are appropriate with current concerns and circumstances.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent lists of endangered species listing; updated BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

There is no new information or circumstances that would change the analysis of the 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?**

Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed action fits within the analysis found in the NEPA documents.

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

Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Phoenix RMP was developed with public consultation.

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
-------------	--------------	------------------------------------

Linda L. Dunlavey, Realty Specialist, BLM Tucson Field Office BLM Tucson Field Office NEPA Review Team		
---	--	--

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 existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda L. Dunlavey  
Signature of Project Lead

\_\_\_\_\_  
Claire Crow  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brian B. Bellew  
Signature of Responsible Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
06/03/2013  
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.

**DECISION:**

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:

Brian B. Bellew  
Field Manager

06/03/2013  
Date

1. The holder of right-of-way No. AZA-35609 agrees to indemnify the United States against any liability arising from the release of any hazardous substance or hazardous waste (as these terms are defined in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, 42 U.S.C. 9601, et seq., or the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C. 6901, et seq.) on the right of way, unless the release is wholly unrelated to the right of way holder's activity on the right-of-way. This agreement applies without regard to whether a release is caused by the holder, its agent, or an unrelated third party.
2. The holder shall fully indemnify, or hold harmless, the United States for any liability, damage, or claims arising in connection with the holder's use and occupancy of the right-of-way.
3. The holder shall maintain the right of way in a safe, useable condition, as directed by the authorized officer and a regular maintenance program shall be maintained.
4. Any cultural and/or paleontological resources (historic or prehistoric site or object) discovered by the holder or any person working on the holders behalf, on public or federal land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer. The holder shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the authorized officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made by the authorized officer to determine the appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The holder will be responsible for the cost of the evaluation and any decision as to the proper mitigation measures will be made by the authorized officer after consulting with the holder.
5. As required by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act regulations at 43 CFR 10.4(g), "If in connection with the project operations under this authorization, any human remains, funerary objects, scared objects or objects of cultural patrimony as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601; 104 Stat. 3048; 25 U.S.C. 3001) are discovered, the ROW holder shall stop operations in the immediate area of the discovery, protect the remains and objects, and immediately notify the Authorized Officer of the discovery. The ROW holder shall continue to protect the immediate area of the discovery until notified by the Authorized Officer that operations may resume."