

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- G020-2013-0032-DNA

Project Name: LCNCA Range Improvements

Case/Project No.: 6090

NLCS Unit: Las Cienegas National Conservation Area

Project Lead: Kristen Duarte

Technical Review:

Criteria Applies?	NAME	CRITERIA	SIGNATURE	DATE
Yes No				
(X) ()		(1) The new proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(X) ()		(2) A reasonable range of alternatives to the new proposed action was analyzed in the document being reviewed.	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(X) ()		(3) The information or circumstances upon which the document being reviewed are based are still valid and germane to the new proposed action.	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(X) ()		(4) The methodology and analytical approach used in the document being reviewed is appropriate for the new action.	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(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.	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(X) ()		(6) The new proposed action, if implemented, would not significantly change the cumulative impact analysis..	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013
(X) ()		(7) Public involvement in the document being reviewed provides suitable coverage for the new proposed action..	NEPA TEAM	7/15/2013

Final Review:

Manager/Supervisor: /s/ David J Baker

Date 07/15/13

Environmental Coordinator: /s/ Dan Moore

Date: 07/15/13

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ- G020-2013-0032-DNA

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No. 6090

Project Title/Type: LCNCA Range Improvements

Location of Proposed Action: Las Cienegas NCA, Empire-Cienega Grazing allotment 6090

Description of the Proposed Action: The grazing leasee proposed to add drinkers, pipelines and storage tanks at existing well sites where the Chiricahua Leopard Frog is or will be re-introduced into existing dirt tanks.

- At Lower Springwater well the proposed action is to add three 800 gallon drinkers with approximately 300 feet of buried pipe to the drinkers from the storage tank.
- At Maternity well the proposed action is to add approximately 100 feet of pipeline running Northeast from the storage tank. Along that line we will place one more 800 gallon drinker in addition to the drinker already there. Also at Maternity (on the Bellotta side of the fenceline) the proposed action is to add approximately 150 feet of pipeline running Southeast from the existing storage tank. Add three 800 gallon drinkers along that pipeline.
- At Empire well the proposed action is to add three 800 gallon livestock drinkers and three 5,000 gallon storage tanks.
- At Cottonwood well the proposed action is to add approximately 300 feet of pipeline Southeast off of the existing storage tank. Along that line we will place four 800 gallon livestock drinkers. The pipeline is black poly material and all pipeline will be buried 18 to 24 inches.

Applicant (if any): Grazing leasee, Ian Tomlinson

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision

Date Approved July 25, 2003

LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____

Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because **it is specifically** provided for in the following LUP decisions: The proposed action is in conformance with the Las Cienegas RMP/EIS and implements decisions WF05, WF18, WF34, AA08, GM20. Review of the RMP has determined that the project, as proposed, would not preclude attainment of any other resource goals, objectives or desired resource

conditions, or otherwise interfere with carrying out other resource decisions contained in the plan. This proposed action has been reviewed to determine if it conforms to the land use plan terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3.

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):

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Programmatic aquatic special status species reintroductions at Las Cienegas National Conservation Area EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 September 21, 2012

This paragraph is from an excerpt from the above listed EA (p.11) with details of the proposed action:

Solar Water Systems and Drinkers: Water will generally be provided from nearby wells equipped with a solar pump and panels. These systems require a panel stand with frame and wiring from the panels to the well. Poles for solar panels would be up to 15 feet tall, and have a dull finish to minimize visual impacts. Pipeline with a 1/12 inch diameter will feed water to storage tanks and drinkers (troughs). The pipe would be buried approximately one foot deep using hand tools (short run). For long lines (>50ft) heavy equipment (e.g., backhoe or bull dozer with trenching attachment) would be used to dig the trench, lay pipeline and bury it. One to four drinkers would be placed at each site. The drinkers would number from two to as many as eight. They would have a capacity of 800 gallons and would be buried six to fourteen inches deep. Water storage units would be located near drinkers. These units would have a capacity of 2,500 to 5000 gallons and are constructed of high strength plastic. Existing open water storage tanks would have wildlife ramps installed to prevent drowning. Storage tanks and troughs would have color tones selected that mimic that of adjacent environments such as trees, grass during the season of highest recreation use, in this case fall through spring (non-growing season color of yellow). Non-reflective paint or an acid treatment wash to metal that produce a rusty non-reflective appearance on metal pipe rails or other metal structures would be used to reduce visual impacts. In addition, solar systems will be placed on the south side of trees in order to further reduce their visibility.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations and monitoring report).

Las Cienegas RMP Biological Opinion #02-21-02-F-162

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the Environmental Assessment (EA) # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028, analyzed the placement of drinking troughs, drinkers and pipelines as part of the proposed action.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the alternatives considered in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 were appropriate for the current proposed action.

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: Yes, the existing analysis is valid for the current proposed action, and new information on resource values and current circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the current 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, all impacts of the current proposed action are similar to those identified in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028. The proposed action will occur at specific livestock development locations that were included in the list of selected pond sites included and analyzed in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028.

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: Yes, public involvement in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 included sending the grazing interested publics a copy of the EA and asking for comments. A 30-day comment period was given. Also, a grazing Proposed Decision was sent to the grazing interested publics for the proposed projects included in the EA. A 30-day protest period is included with the Proposed Decision. No protests were received.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Kristen Duarte	Rangeland Management Specialist	Tucson Field Office
Jeff Simms	Fisheries Biologist	Tucson Field Office
Amy Sobiech	Archaeologist	Tucson Field Office
Ben Lomeli	Hydrologist	Tucson Field Office
Catie Fenn	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Tucson Field Office
Karen Simms	Assistant Field Manager	Tucson Field Office
Amy Markstein	NEPA Coordinator	Tucson Field Office
Claire Crow	NEPA Coordinator	Tucson Field Office

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

The Bureau of Land Management’s Programmatic Environmental Assessment for aquatic special status species reintroductions at Las Cienegas National Conservation Area (EA#: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028), stipulated that each proposed site specific action would be checked for consistency through the Determination of NEPA Adequacy process (DNA). Based on the review documented above for development of the replacement livestock troughs and associated pipelines on Las Cienegas NCA, I conclude that implementation of this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation, EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028, includes a full and sufficient site specific analysis of the proposed action and constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA. Furthermore it is my conclusion that the Final Decisions were based on the analysis in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028, and there is no further BLM decision to be made.

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

/s/ Kristen Duarte

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Dan Moore

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ David Baker

Signature of Responsible Official

07/30/2013

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.