

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

---

**Project Lead:** Erik Pignata

**Field Office:** Sierra Front Field Office

**Lead Office:** Sierra Front Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** NVN 090056

**NEPA NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0016-DNA

**Project Name:** Nevada Hospital Association Fiber Optic Project

**Applicant Name:** Nevada Hospital Association

**Project Location:** Reno to Las Vegas, Nevada – see case file for complete legal land description

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

The Proposed Action is to utilize some different rights-of-way for collocation of a fiber optic cable than were brought forward in a table of the analysis (see Table 3-8; pg. 68; EA number below). The original Proposed Action and analysis involves collocation of a fiber optic cable on existing overhead power and communication lines, as well as either leasing broadband or collocation with conduit in existing underground lines.

The Proposed Action is in the same project area. Agreements are already in place and on file with the BLM between the facility owners and the applicant for use of said facilities by the applicant for this project.

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

*List any applicable LUPs and their dates.*

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Carson City Consolidated Resource Management Plan (May 2001). The sections that apply to this Project include:

- LND-7, Administrative Actions #6: “Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public.”
- ROW-4, Administrative Actions #3: “. . . applicants for right-of-way grants . . . are subject to standard approval procedures outlined in the right-of-way regulations (43 CFR 2800) . . .”

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Tonopah Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision (ROD) (1997). The section that applies to this Project includes:

- Item #6, page 19: “. . . All other lands within the Tonopah Planning Area in which there are no un-resolvable conflicts with other resource values would be open to consideration for linear or areal rights-of-way, lease and land use permits.”

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the ROD for the approved Las Vegas RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement (1998). The section that applies to this Project includes:

- RW-1-h, Management Direction: “All public land within the planning area, except as stated in RW-1-c through RW-1-g are available at the discretion of the agency for rights-of-way under the Federal Land Management Policy Act.” Although RW-1-e states that Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) are avoidance areas, this project is not inconsistent with the ACEC as the new fiber optic bale would be placed on existing poles owned by Valley Electric. The existing transmission line and ROW through the Amargosa Mesquite ACEC pre-dates the ACEC designation. As this fiber optic cable would be placed on existing poles, there would be no ground disturbing activities.

**Name of Plans:** NV – Carson City CRMP; NV – Tonopah RMP; NV – Las Vegas RMP

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

Environmental Analysis # DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2011-0512-EA for NVN 090056; the Decision Record signed by the District Manager, CCDO (lead office) on March 12, 2012.

**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?**

This new Proposed Action is essentially similar to the original Proposed Action analyzed in the existing NEPA document. It is within the same analysis area. There are no differences with the original Proposed Action except the serial numbers of the rights-of-way to be collocated on.

**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 is certainly appropriate with respect to the new proposed action. Many alternate routes of collocation on existing facilities were analyzed. Current concerns/interests/resource values have not changed substantially since the Decision Record was signed.

**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?**

There isn't any new information or circumstances affecting such a non-impactful Proposed Action. The Proposed Action simply is to collocate on facilities that have already been built, using existing roads and disturbed areas to string the new cable. Thus, it can be reasonably concluded that new information and new circumstances 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?**

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from the implementation of the new proposed action would match those analyzed in the existing NEPA document; nothing substantially new is proposed.

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

Yes, public involvement and interagency review already conducted is adequate to cover the current Proposed Action.

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

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Erik Pignata	Realty Specialist	BLM
Brian Buttazoni	P&EC	BLM
Bernadette Lovato	District Manager	BLM
Roberto Corrales	Right-of-way Agent	Optica

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

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bernadette Lovato  
District Manager  
Carson City District Office (lead office)

Date 7/03/2013

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.